

question. I am glad that the Senator from Michigan raised the point, because now we are getting down to the issue of what is wrong with existing law. Do we wish to exempt under some flimflam excuse the right of someone to buy and sell votes, or do we wish to break up the practice? If we wish to break it up we should desire to break it up entirely, whether a voter is voting once or twice, whether he is voting the Democratic ticket, or whether he is voting the Republican ticket.

Whether he is voting for a national candidate or for a State candidate, if a person is being paid, he ought to be prosecuted. The person who is paying him should be prosecuted also.

Mr. President, that is all we would do under the pending amendment. We would cut through all that redtape. I shall be delighted to read the objections if the Attorney General of the United States can raise any.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States is neither a flimflam excuse nor a piece of redtape. Let us get that clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No one has said that it was.

Mr. HART. The interpretation of the Senator has not persuaded me that that is really what is involved. The Attorney General very properly would refrain from bringing criminal cases arising out of State or local elections. Merely adding such a provision to the bill would not add a constitutional right if none theretofore existed. The concern that we have is that for us to pass local election laws, unless they are tied to the 14th and 15th amendments, would clearly constitute an unconstitutional action.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That particular situation involved a road contractor who was trying to obtain a contract for building a road that was being built partly with Federal funds and partly with State funds. He was approached and asked to make a contribution to the campaign and promised that in turn he was to get the contract. Supposedly we have laws prohibiting corporations making political contributions, particularly under such circumstances. We have laws to prohibit kickbacks on contracts in which Federal money is involved. However, in that case the Attorney General came back and said that unless I could prove that the payment was made, and that the money was used for the purpose of attempting to elect national candidates who were on the ticket that year there was nothing he could do about it.

I say again that it boils down to the following question: Are we for clean elections or are we not? The committee itself has already gone part way. The bill which was reported by the committee and supposedly supported by the administration provides that it shall be a Federal crime if anyone buys an illegal vote or pays a person to register fraudulently. If the voter voted a second time it would be a Federal crime if he were paid, but under the bill he could be paid if he should vote only once. So far as

the bill is concerned there is nothing against that possibility.

Surely that is not what the committee means to do.

On the other hand, a person might be paid \$5 or \$10 to register. If he should register properly all well and good, but if he should register illegally the person who registered and the person who paid him would be subject to a fine. I think it is silly to approach the problem in any such manner. Either we are against the practice of vote buying all the way across the board or we are not. The committee itself, in section 9 of the bill, has already made the determination that it will deal with elections in all 50 States. I understand that this provision was supported by the Senator from Michigan. A majority of the committee, including the Senator from Michigan, though that we had a constitutional right to adopt that provision. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HART. The Senator is now speaking of the poll tax provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. I agree with the Senator on that. I shall support him on that provision. At the same time in supporting him in reference to that provision and agreeing with him on that I maintain also that we have the right to go into the same 50 States on the same principle and say that clean elections shall be held in those States.

Mr. HART. The Senator knows that we do not attempt to reach State or local elections with a criminal sanction on payment for fraudulent registration in voting. Why? Because we had very grave doubt that on that basis we could. It is that point to which I reply. It is not a piece of red tape or flimflam. It is a very serious problem.

Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oregon has a point of personal privilege that he wishes to make. I yield to him for that purpose.

VIETNAM—PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may take the floor for such time as I think necessary on a matter of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to lay the foundation for my discussion of this question of personal privilege, I ask unanimous consent that the brilliant argument and speech made by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] at the Students for a Democratic Society rally held in Washington, D.C., on April 17, 1965, at the Sylvan Theater be printed at this point in my remarks. I also ask that it be followed by a column written by Murray Kempton for the New York World Telegram of April 23 concerning a debate between Senator GRUENING and Assistant Secretary of State William Bundy.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, DEMOCRAT, OF ALASKA, AT RALLY OF VIETNAM SPONSORED BY STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY AT SYLVAN THEATER, APRIL 17, 1965

Thank you for inviting me to speak to you this afternoon on the undeclared war in Vietnam.

It is particularly gratifying to me, in addressing similar groups such as this from coast to coast, to find on university campus after university campus both the faculties and students discussing in an informed and informative manner the issues involved in Vietnam.

The extensive use of teach-ins is a promising and welcome development.

Such discussions of the pros and cons of the U.S. position in Vietnam are healthy in a democratic society such as ours. Your right to petition the Congress is a right guaranteed by the Constitution—it is a right forming the very cornerstone of that Constitution—it is a right which you are exercising today in protesting against the continuation of the present U.S. policies in Vietnam—policies which violate the basic principles upon which our democracy was founded and which has heretofore distinguished our Nation from the totalitarian, Fascist, and Communist governments of the right and the left.

The United States has always stood for government by the people—government by majority rule—with full protection for the rights of minorities.

But the course of action followed by the United States in Vietnam under three separate administrations has not been governed by adherence to the principle of government by the consent of the governed.

It is not sufficient to justify the U.S. actions in Vietnam in supporting oppressive governments in South Vietnam on the ground that the government of North Vietnam is a totalitarian, Communist government and likewise does not represent the will of its peoples, who have been deprived of their rights.

We should not be surprised when Communist nations act like Communist nations.

But we should be surprised when the United States, which has been in the forefront of the fight to free oppressed peoples throughout the world, has for 10 years now backed oppressive governments in South Vietnam, and in support of which the United States has now escalated its military actions into North Vietnam.

The roots of the present dilemma facing the United States in Vietnam go back to our decision to back France after World War II when it sought to regain Vietnam as a colony of France.

That was a serious mistake on the part of the United States.

Anticolonialism has been the longstanding policy of the United States. We have sought no colonies for ourselves. We should not have backed the French when they sought to reimpose the yoke of colonialism upon the people of Vietnam.

The United States supported France in its colonialization efforts in Vietnam to the tune of \$2 billion.

In doing so, the United States became identified with France in the minds of the Vietnamese who were fighting for their freedom from any sort of foreign rule. The people of Vietnam fought as strongly against the French as they had fought hundreds of years before to oust the Chinese.

With the decisive military defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu in May of 1954, it became evident to the people of France—as it should have become evident to the people of the United States long since—that the war in Vietnam was not to be won on the battlefield, but was a political struggle

April 26, 1965

and could and should be settled at the conference table.

Then came the Geneva conference attended by representatives of France, the United States, the United Kingdom, Soviet Russia, Communist China, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and the Vietnamese Communist regime.

At Geneva, the conferees agreed to four conditions:

First, Vietnam was to be partitioned along the 17th parallel into North and South Vietnam.

Second, Regulations were imposed on foreign military personnel and on increased armaments.

Third, Countrywide elections, leading to the reunification of North and South Vietnam were to be held by July 20, 1956.

Fourth, An International Control Commission—ICC—was to be established to supervise the implementation of the agreements.

The United States did not sign the Geneva agreement.

However, it did issue a statement—unilaterally—promising: "It (1) will refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb the Geneva agreements; (2) would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security, and (3) shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections, supervised by the U.N. to insure that they are conducted fairly."

The armistice agreement—and it was never intended to be more than an armistice until the two halves of Vietnam could be unified—was signed at Geneva on July 21, 1954.

On October 10, 1954, the Vietnamese Communist regime took over North of the 17th parallel under Ho Chi Minh.

Ho Chi Minh immediately took control over North Vietnam in typical Communist style, imposing a tight police state there with all the loss of individual and economic freedoms implicit in such a takeover.

Fifteen days after the Vietnamese Communists took over in the north, South Vietnam became an independent nation south of the 17th parallel with the U.S. hand-picked Ngo Dinh Diem as premier.

This was the opportunity the United States had in South Vietnam to show that south of the 17th parallel true democracy could flourish and the people there could live in peace with their individual freedoms preserved and, assisted by U.S. economic aid, enjoying ever-increasing social and economic benefits.

Remember, South Vietnam is the breadbasket of southeast Asia. North Vietnam is the poor part of Vietnam. The United States had everything working in its favor to turn South Vietnam into a showcase so that when the elections called for in July of 1956 under the Geneva Convention took place, Hanoi would be outvoted and the people would choose to be reunited under the leadership of non-Communists.

But we threw away our opportunity.

We did not insist on individual freedoms, but stood by while Diem imposed an ever-increasing terroristic, brutal, corrupt government.

Economic and social benefits for the people were forgotten while Diem, with the help of millions upon millions of American taxpayers dollars conquered faction after faction in South Vietnam to impose on it his iron, ruthless rule. South Vietnam—like North Vietnam—became a police state.

When the time came for the unification elections called for by the Geneva Convention—which we had agreed to in our unilateral protocol—we pulled the string on our puppet Diem and he refused to go through with the reunification elections, playing right into the hands of the Vietnamese Communists both in South Vietnam and in North Vietnam.

Before being overrun by the Chinese, Vietnam had been an independent nation for some eight hundred years. Its people wanted both independence and unity.

When Diem refused unification elections, the people knew that reunification and self-determination could come about only through armed resistance.

Many of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam in the early stages of the guerrilla war there were former Vietminh fighters who had gotten their training in the fight against France. Many went North to Hanoi for training there, slipping back to South Vietnam to rejoin the fighting. North Vietnamese Communists joined them in increasing numbers as the years fled by and Diem's government became harsher and harsher.

War is not a pleasant pursuit wherever and whenever fought.

Both the South Vietnamese and the Vietcong, together with their North Vietnamese Communist supporters, fight with brutality, sadism and torture. Perhaps by Asiatic standards anything goes in wartime.

In addition, Diem—openly supported by the United States economically and militarily—sought to retain his domination over South Vietnam and the rule of his corrupt henchmen, practiced torture not in the course of waging war on the battlefield, but against civilians in the torture chambers in Saigon operated by Diem's secret police.

The facts of what went on in South Vietnam before, during and after Diem's regime are now slowly coming to light.

I strongly commend to your attention two new books by two Pulitzer Prize winning authors.

The first, already on the bookstands, is entitled, "The New Face of War," and is by Associated Press Reporter Malcome W. Browne.

The second, which will be released in approximately 10 days, is by New York Times Reporter David Halberstam, and is entitled, "The Making of a Quagmire."

Both these books are must reading for anyone who would understand how the United States got into its present predicament in Vietnam. Both have been excellently reviewed by I. F. Stone in the current issue of the New York Review of Books.

You all recall how, after the fall of Diem, the basic instability of the government in South Vietnam and its lack of a firm basis in popular support became apparent in coup after coup until it became difficult at any given moment to tell who was in charge of the store.

This situation, so reminiscent of a comic opera if it were not so tragic, was best described by the noted columnist, Art Buchwald, last September which in humorous form punctures the myth that we came there in response to a request from the government of Vietnam, a request which, incidentally, we fostered. That government has long since gone and the United States is now in effect the government. This is what Buchwald wrote:

"Probably the man who has the toughest job in the world at the moment is Henry Cabot Lodge, who has been traveling around the world at the request of President Johnson, explaining our Vietnam policies to heads of state.

"Although we haven't attended any of the briefings, we can just imagine what is going on as Ambassador Lodge is presenting his case, let us say, to the King of Denmark.

"Now, sir, let me say at the outset that the United States has the situation in Vietnam well in hand. Under the firm leadership of Gen. Nguyen Khanh many new reforms have been instituted."

"As Ambassador Lodge is speaking, a courier from the American Embassy rushes in and gives him a telegram. The Ambassador reads it.

"Well, as I was saying, General Khanh has

been dividing the country and the United States feels he can no longer control the various factions. It is our belief that the best solution to the problem would be to support a general who has the confidence of the people."

"The phone rings and the King hands it to Ambassador Lodge.

"Yes, I see, sir. Right, sir. I understand. Of course. Thank you."

"He hangs up the phone and continues: 'You see, Your Majesty, our experts believe the best solution to the problem would be to have a three-man military junta govern until we can have elections. We feel General Khanh has been a handicap and we intend to support General Minh, whom General Khanh had disposed of several months ago with our help. Our strategy is to send the South Vietnamese Army out into the field to fight the Vietcong on their own terms.'

"An aid whispers something in Ambassador Lodge's ear. He nods and says, 'Because of the rioting in Saigon our strategy has been flexible and we are now urging the South Vietnamese forces to return to Saigon to prevent the breakdown of law and order. We feel this can best be done with General Minh in command of the —'

"Another messenger from the American Embassy dashes in and hands Lodge a cable.

"Therefore, in line with what our people have worked out, we are happy to announce that Dr. Nguyen Xuan Oanh is now in charge of the Saigon government. Dr. Oanh is a Harvard-educated economist and gets along very well with Ambassador Taylor. General Khanh is now in Dalat resting up from a physical and mental breakdown."

"The phone rings again and Ambassador Lodge answers it. 'Thank you very much. That's very interesting.'

"I want you to understand, Your Majesty, we have not ruled out General Khanh's contribution to our effort in Vietnam. We have decided that in spite of everything he still holds the title of Premier and we have every intention at this time of supporting his government."

"The Ambassador's secretary hands him another paper.

"As you have probably read, the main problem in Vietnam is the friction between the Catholics and the Buddhists. Realizing this, the Americans have a plan to prevent rioting between the two factions."

"The secretary hands him another paper.

"But we feel at the same time that some rioting would have a good effect and therefore we've authorized the riots now going on throughout the country."

"Our main objective, of course, is to win the war, but we realize that this cannot be done until there is a stable government in Vietnam. We feel we have such a government with Dr. Oanh and * * *"

"The phone rings again and Ambassador Lodge answers it wearily. 'Yes, sir. Whom did you say? Mme. Nhu? Thank you.'

"He turns back to the King. 'Well, where was I?'"

And now we are off again with Henry Cabot Lodge recalled to gather support for the U.S. position in other countries.

So the United States has fumbled and bumbled along in Vietnam for over 10 years now, disregarding our international obligations and commitments.

We violated two commitments of the Geneva Convention which we unilaterally agreed to support.

We increased the armaments and military personnel in South Vietnam and prevented the holding of unification elections called for by that Convention.

But further we failed to live up to our commitment under the United Nations Charter.

Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations states: "The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endan-

April 26, 1965

8151

ger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

The United States has sought no solution to the conflict in Vietnam by negotiation.

The United States has sought no solution to the conflict in Vietnam by inquiry.

The United States has sought no solution to the conflict in Vietnam by mediation.

The United States has sought no solution to the conflict in Vietnam by conciliation.

The United States has sought no solution to the conflict in Vietnam by arbitration.

The United States has sought no solution to the conflict in Vietnam by judicial settlement.

The United States has sought no solution to the conflict in Vietnam by resorting to regional agencies or arrangements.

The United States has sought no solution to the conflict in Vietnam by any other peaceful means.

That is why I have maintained for over a year, and continue to maintain, that if we had waged peace as vigorously as we have waged war we would not now be in the mess we're in.

Within 2 months after the Geneva Convention was signed in 1954, a conference was convened in Manila and a collective security pact was signed known as the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Pact. It was signed by the Governments of Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The parties agreed to protect these countries from "armed attack and countersubversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability."

Are allied soldiers from Australia in the front lines fighting and dying alongside U.S. soldiers and marines? They are not. And where are the French soldiers, the New Zealand soldiers, the Pakistani soldiers, the Philippine soldiers, the Thailand soldiers, the United Kingdom soldiers?

"They are not there or if so in only token numbers. At present the United States is going it alone in Vietnam. From reactions in other capitals of the free world, it looks as if the United States will continue to go it alone, often even without the moral support of our SEATO allies, and despite our Government's earnest pleadings for their participation.

And now the United States has escalated the war by air strikes into North Vietnam, while the voices are being raised to send more and more troops into South Vietnam.

As the able publisher of the Detroit Free Press, Miami Herald, Akron Beacon Journal, and other dailies, John S. Knight, one of the great figures in the world of American journalism, stated it:

"The South Vietnamese ground forces cannot cope with their enemies from the North. U.S. troops are engaged in combat, and there is talk in Washington of committing some 250,000 more to the struggle.

"The fact is that we are not winning this war. Nor can we so long as the Republic of South Vietnam is infiltrated by the enemy. As Richard Dudman of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has reported, 'Our side may still control the cities and the air, but their side controls the great majority of the countryside and commands the allegiance of the great majority of the people.'"

There have been ever mounting protests against the escalation policy in Vietnam.

We might, perhaps, by sending the million men to Vietnam which Hanson Baldwin, the military critic of the New York Times, has proposed and reflects some of the thinking in the Pentagon to keep that area in subjection. But what then? Do we propose to stay there indefinitely and hold Vietnam as conquered territory. Sooner or later that

would lead to an all-out Asian war in which there could be no victors and only staggering losses. That is why I say we cannot win the war. Certainly not by military means.

The St. Louis Post Dispatch put the spotlight on the basic problem when it advised the President "to repudiate the misguided advisers who, in the name of a bankrupt philosophy of containment have led him, step by disastrous step, into an Asian morass."

Two thousand five hundred ministers, priests, and rabbis cried out in one voice in a newspaper advertisement: "Mr. President, In the Name of God, Stop It," saying in part:

"It is not a light thing for an American to say that he is dismayed by his country's actions. We do not say it lightly, but soberly and in deep distress. Our Government's action in Vietnam have been and continue to be unworthy either on the high standards of our common religious faith, or of the lofty aspirations on which this country was founded.

"Now the United States has begun the process of extending the war beyond the borders of South Vietnam, with all the attendant dangers of precipitating a far greater conflict perhaps even on a global and nuclear scale.

"Mr. President, we plead with you to reverse this course. Let us admit our mistakes and work for an immediate cease-fire. Let us call a conference of all the nations involved, including China, not alone to conclude peace but to launch at once a major and cooperative effort to heal and rebuild that wounded land.

"Mr. President, we plead with you with the utmost urgency to turn our Nation's course, before it is too late, from cruelty to compassion, from destruction to healing, from retaliation to reconciliation, from war to peace."

Heading the list of 2,500 clergymen are such outstanding individuals as Bishop John Wesley Lord, Washington area, Methodist Church; Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president, Unitarian Universalist Association; Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, former president, National Council of Churches; Father Peter Riga, moderator, Catholic Council on Civil Liberties; Dr. Isidor B. Hoffman, chaplain to Jewish students, Columbia University; and Dr. Henry J. Cadbury, biblical scholar, former chairman of the American Friends Service Committee.

My able and distinguished Senate colleague, Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, in an able article in this week's Saturday Evening Post entitled: "We Should Negotiate a Settlement in Vietnam" states: "Our struggle in South Vietnam has reached a point where neither side can achieve a conclusive military decision, and the only visible prospect for a solution is to be found at the conference table. But there is so much Washington talk about stepping up the war that it threatens to engulf all rational discussion of the crisis we face—almost as if peace were something to be avoided."

I agree. But meetings such as this one this afternoon, if conducted in an orderly, thoughtful manner should help in showing that the voices of reason will not be stilled.

The Students for a Democratic Society are to be highly commended for sponsoring this gathering. I appreciate the fact that there are those elements, both fascist and communist, which seek to pervert events such as this for their own mischievous ends. But the voices of reason will not be stilled by such tactics—and the people of the United States will recognize that their own stake in preventing further escalation of this war in Vietnam are too great to be swayed by fascist or communist diversionary tactics.

We stand today on the brink of a world war of cataclysmic proportions.

In commenting on the President's speech

in which he offered unconditional negotiations, the noted columnist Walter Lippmann stated: "Though no one can prove it, it is just possible that a year ago that such a Presidential statement could have changed the course of the war."

As it happens, I have been speaking out constantly on this subject for over a year.

In a major address on the Senate floor on March 10, 1964, I urged that the United States take its troops out of Vietnam. I expressed then, and have repeatedly ever since, my view that the United States had no business being in South Vietnam militarily, that we should never have gone in, that we should never have stayed in, that the security of the United States was in no wise jeopardized or imperiled by whatever happened in Vietnam, and that all of Vietnam was not worth the life of a single American boy. We have now lost over 400 of them. And if this war continues, if it escalates still more, as there appears to be every likelihood of its doing, our casualty lists will mount to even more tragic proportions.

I pointed out at that time that President Johnson had inherited the mess in South Vietnam from previous administrations; that it was not of his making, that he could and should reverse the policies of his predecessors. And if he had acted then, as Walter Lippmann has pointed out, disengagement and a negotiated peace would have been a lot easier to achieve. Moreover, our pledge to the United Nations, in article 33, the conditions of which I have cited, made such action mandatory before we increased our military participation, which in itself constituted a violation of the Geneva agreement and our unilateral commitment to it. Consequently, when we charge treaty violation against North Vietnam, let us look at the beam in our own eye.

In consequence of my deep convictions on this subject, I was unable to vote for the resolution sent to the Congress by the White House last August, approving not only of what had been done by the administration in Vietnam, but authorizing the President to use our Armed Forces as he saw fit anywhere in southeast Asia. Only two of us in the Congress voted against this resolution. My distinguished colleague, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, who was the other Member of the Senate to vote against this resolution, has repeatedly pointed out that we are conducting war in Vietnam in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Despite congressional ratification of the resolution, there has been no declaration of war by Congress as the Constitution provides. Of course, there should not be such a declaration, but neither should we be carrying on a war as we are doing.

But now is not the time to reminisce about what might have been.

Now is not the time to point out the follies and errors of the past.

Now is the time to think ahead and find a decent way out.

Now is the time to take positive action to wage peace as actively and forcibly as we have been and now seem determined to wage war.

President Johnson is to be commended for modifying a previous stand and declaring that the United States is willing to enter into negotiations without any preconditions.

That is a good first step but it is only the beginning.

More needs to be done.

The United States should immediately announce the cessation of our bombings in North Vietnam, at the very least for a period while negotiations can go forward not at the point of a gun.

The United States should seek to negotiate an immediate cease-fire in South Vietnam. We should do this by recognizing the clear facts of life: the war in South Vietnam is basically a civil war, the control of which

does not rest in the capital of North Vietnam—Hanoi—or in Communist China, which our war hawks are apparently baiting to come into the conflict.

Well, China has not yet come in, and in view of our provocative actions and utterances appears to me to have shown, to date, admirable self-restraint.

It is also possible that China as yet feels no need to come in and feels that the United States has trapped itself into a mess which ideally suits China's purposes and propaganda.

"Here," the Chinese may well be thinking, "the United States is ensnared all alone in a bloody war, costly in lives and dollars, sinking in more deeply every day, pitting white men against Asiatics in the Asian homeland, and being fought to a standstill by a small Asiatic nation."

"Why interfere? The U.S. course suits us perfectly. It is alienating its own allies and neutrals and thereby strengthening China's position in the world."

Yes, we are probably helping the very cause which it is our officially declared purpose to defeat.

The ultimate control of the civil war in South Vietnam rests with the Vietcong, and they must be brought to the conference table.

We should then take every honorable opportunity to seek an international peace conference. We should work night and day to bring this about.

Nor do I share the view which is given in justification of our military action, past, present, and future, that a cessation will lead to the loss of all southeast Asia, then of the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, and that we shall then be obliged to fight Communist invasion on the beaches of Hawaii and California. This view strikes me as utter nonsense. This is the John Foster Dulles domino theory raised to new heights of absurdity.

As far as southeast Asia is concerned, the future may not be certain but it is a risk that I think all concerned should be prepared to take in view of the tragic alternatives. The people of Vietnam fought Chinese domination in the past for generations. They no more want domination by China than they wanted domination by the French, by the Americans, or by any outsiders. I think we would probably get in South Vietnam a Titoist form of communism, seeking independence from control by Peiping, the very situation that the United States has invested \$2 billion to create in Yugoslavia. Actually, our military activity which pits Western whites against Asiatics, our use of bombing, of napalm, and gas, is more likely to produce the undesirable results which it is our declared purpose to obviate. For if our escalation brings the Chinese into the war and they once move into Vietnam presumably to defend it, it may be difficult to get them out.

As for the insular countries in the Pacific—the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand—the United States complete control by sea and airpower of the Pacific makes such a conjuncture, namely that they will fall unless we carry on militarily in Vietnam, manifestly ridiculous.

Perhaps, as has been suggested by my colleague, an able student of the Far East and majority leader of the Senate, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, we should seize the opportunity of what appears to be a forthcoming international conference on the security of Cambodia's borders to widen the topics to be discussed to include the security of Vietnam.

The United States is a great and powerful nation founded on the principles of peace and freedom. It behooves the United States not to adopt totalitarian tactics that have, in the past, characterized both Fascists and Communist regimes.

The United States should, without delay, focus the spotlight not on the arrows but on the olive branch also carried in our national emblem by the American eagle, and seek an honorable and just peace in Vietnam and an end to the needless killings there.

[From the New York World-Telegram, Apr. 23, 1965]

THE FIRST DEBATE (By Murray Kempton)

William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State, and Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, debated our Vietnam policy last night at Joan of Arc School on the West Side.

William Bundy came through a cluster of the youth against war and fascism wearing their "Stop the War" buttons and sat down with GRUENING for a predebate television spot. Their host asked for voice levels. "Now is the time for all good men," GRUENING began, "to come to the aid of their party," the Assistant Secretary of State finished.

He looked across Jim Jensen at GRUENING and smiled: "And that means Democrats."

We were watching an event for which there was no remembered precedent in our history. If we are not at war in Vietnam, we are indisputably engaged in what Bundy prefers to call a "sober and measured military effort." And now a representative of the President of the United States was publicly debating a Senator from the President's own party who wants to stop the war before an audience overwhelmingly of the President's party and, by any measure of its response, demonstrably hostile to his policy.

ERNEST GRUENING was not to be placated. "The President's policies," he told the cameras, "are leading directly to a major war. He says he wants no wider war, but he's widening it all the time."

They went off to the stage. Congressman WILLIAM RYAN introduced Bundy first.

Bundy arose, tall and weary, to say what an honor it was to share the floor with a man like Senator GRUENING and to meet the reform Democrats.

He recalled the lessons of the 1930's. We had fought Japan to prevent one nation from dominating Asia. "We seek no territory and we seek no bases in southeast Asia."

The United States, he said, is going about its business "in as measured and sober a way as you can carry out a military campaign." At which eight of the Youth Against War unfurled a sheet of paper painted "Stop the War in Vietnam," and began to chant the slogan over and over, until four or five volunteers came over and tore up the sheet and a policeman came and took them out. It did not seem an unpopular act of repression. Bundy began again, "The effort must be pushed in the maximum in the south. The job can be done." He repeated Johnson's promise that we will not withdraw, and sat down.

RYAN began to introduce GRUENING; he came to the citation, a Senate speech called "The United States Should Get Out of Vietnam," and suddenly the applause was twice as loud as any that had followed Bundy and people were standing up.

GRUENING was a small man behind a forest of microphones, with an old, strong and amiable voice.

"We say," the voice declared, "that we are doing what we are doing because other people could not be trusted. But we have violated three different treaties. * * * The bombing of North Vietnam is a wholly disastrous piece of folly which makes us absolutely disgraceful before the whole world * * * After 2 months of bombing, we are not better off than we were before. We should stop it and we should never have done it * * * After you've been bombing villages with napalm, it's going to be very difficult to persuade people that you're their friends."

The applause lasted more than a minute.

Bundy would work on through an hour before an audience nasty in patches but in general politely disaffected. But the point is not that audience—the West Side may be thought of as exotic. It is rather ERNEST GRUENING and that conception of the national honor which he has the strength so matter of factly to express at a moment very like a time of war. We are arguing at last in public; and there are not any generations which have lived through an occasion as great as that quite simple thing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a further foundation for my discussion of this question of personal privilege, and for the benefit of the warmonger spokesmen of the Johnson administration, including the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, I ask unanimous consent that a speech that I made at a teach-in all-night seminar session at the University of Oregon last Friday night be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO WHAT PURPOSE WAR IN ASIA?

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg., April 23, 1965)

It is with both pleasure and pride that I accepted your invitation to speak on behalf of the faculty-student committee to stop the war in Vietnam. I am proud not only to be here, but I am proud that the University of Oregon is part of a great, swelling tide of opposition in this country to the war in Asia, and to the use of force which is rapidly becoming the monster that controls its maker instead of the other way around.

There is today a war in Asia that is as much the making of the United States as it is of any other country. And one cannot read the daily paper or listen to the presentations of administration officials in the confines of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee without realizing that the only plans of the American Government are plans for making it steadily bigger.

The whys and wherefores of this war are but vaguely known to the American people and even to the Congress. The contingencies being planned for are not known at all. The ways in which the bombing of the north are supposed to produce peace remain in the realm of pure mysticism.

Yet this week, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Ambassador Taylor, General Wheeler, General Westmoreland, Admiral Sharp, and other military commanders met in Hawaii to plan the further military steps by the United States within South Vietnam against North Vietnam. They take the form of the familiar prescription the Military Establishment has dished up for southeast Asia for the last 5 years—to increase the South Vietnamese forces from 575,000 to 735,000 men, to build up American ground combat forces to several divisions, and to intensify the bombing of military targets and supply routes from the north into the south.

It is to the great peril of the United States and the American people that it is in a military conference of military men in Hawaii that the foreign policy of this country is being made, a foreign policy that is leading the American people into the jaws of both China and Russia, while at the same time stripping us of friends and allies in all parts of the world.

Five years ago we were concerned about a civil war in Vietnam. So we threw American money, weapons, and prestige into that war in an effort to turn the tide in favor of the faction we preferred. Today, more than 30,000 U.S. troops are in the war, hundreds

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8153

of American aircraft are attacking North Vietnam, and more of the same is being planned. From a civil war in South Vietnam, the conflict has seen North Vietnam brought directly into the battle, the setting up of Soviet antiaircraft missiles to ward off U.S. planes, and the preparation by China to send its armed forces into the fray.

All this has come about because the United States has preferred war to seeing itself proved wrong and mistaken in its support 10 years ago of Ngo Dinh Diem.

The takeover by the military of American policy in Asia is producing not one advantage for the United States. It is not strengthening freedom in Vietnam, north or south. It is not gaining friends, admirers, or allies in Asia for the United States. Yet if it is not to strengthen freedom and maintain strong allies in Asia, what in the world is our policy in Asia?

Why are we fighting? Why do we insist that South Vietnam must remain non-Communist (one cannot say "free" because it is not free)? Why do our advocates of more war in Vietnam believe the United States must fight the Vietcong itself if it is not for the notion that by so doing we are going to establish and maintain some kind of anti-Communist ring around China and North Vietnam?

The whole object of the war effort is to contain China and to keep the other nations of Asia from falling into her sphere. But the use of military means to reach that end is destroying the very end itself.

It is destroying it by driving into opposition the countries we claim we are saving.

There are in Asia six nations that in terms of area, population, industrial capacity, and resources must be regarded as major powers. They are the Soviet Union, China, India, Pakistan, Japan, and Indonesia. Of these, we are driving headlong into direct military conflict with two: China and the Soviet Union. In fact, our expansion of the war by bombing North Vietnam made that result inevitable, for it compelled both those Communist countries to compete with each other in the race to come to the aid of North Vietnam.

So when the Soviet Union announced that many volunteers desired to go to North Vietnam, and offered its antiaircraft missiles, with Russian technicians to man them, China upped the stakes by announcing its preparations to send the Chinese Army into the fray, not as volunteers, but in defense of a country on its borders that was under attack.

Nearly all the assessments offered to date by our American spokesmen have sought to allay fears that the war in Vietnam would drive China and Russia back together. Time and again, questioning Members of Congress have been told that such a result was not considered likely, because Russia is too anxious to concentrate her attention and resources on improving the living standards of her own people.

But what is at stake for Russia and China is the leadership of the Communist world. Neither can afford to allow a sister Communist state, especially a small one, to be shot up like a fish in a barrel by the United States without coming to her aid in one form or another.

It is not a question of whether China and Russia are going to become warm international bedfellows. But it is a question of whether they are going to put men and weapons into North Vietnam that will mean a major war with the United States, and that is exactly what both are preparing to do.

Where do we stand with the other great powers of Asia? How about Pakistan and India?

Because Pakistan has persistently criticized the U.S. war effort in Vietnam, and expressed a certain degree of sympathy and support for China in recent years, a planned visit to this country by its President Ayub was postponed at our request. And in order to even up things between Pakistan and her archenemy, India, we asked Prime Minister Shastri to postpone his visit, too.

Mr. Shastri promptly announced he was canceling his visit to Washington, though he would come to Canada, and to Moscow. Next June we will witness the spectacle of a Prime Minister on the receiving end of close to half a billion in American aid each year visiting Canada, from where he receives next to nothing, but passing up the United States because our relations are too strained. That, incidentally, tells you a lot about our foreign aid program, as well as our policy in Asia.

The reaction to Washington's postponement of the visits has not only been violent, but has served to strengthen both Pakistan and India in their objections to U.S. intervention in Asia. Mr. Shastri, for example, repeated his demand that the United States halt its air attacks on North Vietnam, a statement widely hailed in India as one that stands up to President Johnson and what Indian papers are calling his bullying diplomacy. For the first time in his career, Mr. Shastri has all political factions in India firmly united behind him in his response to the clumsy attempt to whip India into line along with Pakistan on the question of the war in Vietnam.

In Pakistan, we read that the toll of U.S. dead in Vietnam does not alter the image of the struggle there as one with racial overtones in which the United States is seen as insensitive to the military devastation of an Asian country. Memories of Hiroshima are being evoked, and the government-controlled Pakistani newspapers are pointedly asking whether the United States would be risking its present bombing strategy in any European country. A leading newspaper, *Dawn*, observes that it is "painful to see how little Americans know of the heart of Asia, where they want to act as perpetual policemen to 'protect' Asians against Asians. Should large-scale war flare up in Vietnam," it continues, "Asia will emerge in ruins and the very prospect which the West today dreads so much—the rise of communism—will then become a certainty."

A fifth leading nation of the area is Indonesia. In a recent television interview, President Sukarno responded to a question about Communist aggression in Vietnam with an insulting question of his own: "What Communist aggression?" On Wednesday we learn that Indonesia intends to be counted in on any Asian side against the United States, because that is the meaning of its announcement that thousands of volunteers are appearing at government offices to go to the defense of North Vietnam.

The only major Asian power that gives so much as lip service to the American war effort is Japan. Yet her people are so opposed to that war that the Japanese Prime Minister Sato sent his own personal representative to tour the area and to make his own assessment of the effectiveness and future of our policy. His report to Sato was all against us.

He found that probably 30 percent of the Vietcong were Communists, that the Vietcong cannot be considered as controlled by either Hanoi or Peking, and that the United States was greatly mistaken in thinking that military force would solve matters. It may be some time before Japan officially changes its position but its repeated statements to China that Japan and China have no great conflicts between them is a hint of what is to come.

The war hawks and their newspaper mouthpieces will tell you that we must stop concerning ourselves with what other countries think, and do what we think is right in Asia. But everything they want us to do there is supposed to be for the benefit not of the United States, but of India, Pakistan, Japan, Indonesia, and the smaller countries of the area to save them from communism. Why it is, then, that they do not appreciate that we know better what is right for them than they do?

I suggest that the editorial I have quoted from *Dawn* tells our military leadership in the Pentagon something that they apparently will never figure out for themselves; namely, that the great advances made by communism have been made in the ruins of war. The destruction and desolation of military force can kill a lot of Communists. But it also makes Communists where none existed before. And it produces the disruption and breakdown of society which is the great opportunity that communism seizes.

There is nothing wrong with President Johnson's offer of April 7 to help develop the Mekong River Valley. But what is wrong with the speech he made on that occasion is that he revealed no plans for ending the war which is making development impossible anywhere in southeast Asia. And within 2 weeks, his military high command was meeting in Hawaii to plan the next escalation of the action.

I ask you, as I have asked administration officials as they have come before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: Can you tell me how carrying the war to the north is going to bring an end to the war?

And the answer is the one we hear week after week from our Secretary of State, by way of his chant about making China and North Vietnam leave their neighbors alone. To go 8,000 miles away—alone—to make someone else leave their neighbors alone is perhaps the most hypocritical assumption of the role of international policeman that any nation ever claimed for itself.

It is not going to defeat the Vietcong. It is going to have no other result than to bring China and Russia, as well as the United States, into the war.

Why, indeed, should North Vietnam stop whatever it is that she is doing that Secretary Rusk cannot describe but what he assures us North Vietnam knows—when it has been our own position that we would not quit the war while we were losing? Do we think North Vietnam will cry "surrender" and ask for negotiations when we would not under the same circumstances? Do we think that North Vietnam will do as we say but not as we did, which was to escalate the war in order to put ourselves in a stronger bargaining position?

The returns are coming in on all these assumptions and they spell not peace on American terms but bigger and more terrible war.

I do not suggest that at any point has North Vietnam been innocent of illegal action under the Geneva agreement. Nor do I doubt that in recent months and perhaps in recent years, the Vietcong movement has received considerable advice and support from North Vietnam. But violations by one side do not excuse violations by the other. Terrorist methods employed by one side have been matched by terrorism employed by the other. The United States had the clear duty and obligation under international law to petition the United Nations for redress of North Vietnam's violation of the Geneva agreement. Why didn't we? History for generations to come will continue to ask the United States that question. It will also continue to find us of having been guilty of

substituting the jungle law of military might for our often professed ideal of the rule of law through international agreement in cases of threats to the peace of the world. In southeast Asia we have walked out on our ideals and joined the Communists in becoming a threat to the peace of the world.

Each escalation by the United States has resulted in a responding escalation within South Vietnam, and we are now at the point where the next escalation could well result in a direct response from Hanoi. Each violation and retaliation has served to worsen and not to improve the American position.

What I am saying is that our reliance upon wealth and military power to bring about a prowestern government in South Vietnam has been a failure. It does not matter that our designs upon that country are not the same as were the French designs. Our methods are much the same, and they are failing every bit as surely as did the French methods.

If we do not seek traditional colonial objectives, we do seek in Vietnam the nationalist objective of American military security as we see it. We have already demonstrated that far from seeking the free political choice for the people of Vietnam we do not intend to let them choose anything contrary to American interests. We have let Vietnam and the entire world know that the United States considers South Vietnam as something to be lost or held by the United States, and we will kill as many of its people and destroy as much of its property as is necessary to hold it.

Our success with that objective is going to be all downhill, just as it has been downhill for 10 years. We could not cope with rebellion within the south and now we cannot cope with assistance to it from the north. We have thrown our 7th Fleet, hundreds of aircraft, and thousands of U.S. troops into the battle without success and we have not yet encountered the Army of North Vietnam, much less that of China.

Our raids on North Vietnam have been illegal under the United Nations Charter. And they have failed in their purpose of making the Vietcong give up. One thing they have done has been to alienate the major countries of Asia and to cause serious alarm among the countries of Western Europe.

Our real problem in Vietnam is that we cannot control the situation by the means we know best—money and military force. We cannot control it because we want the area to remain pro-Western and to serve as a bulwark against Chinese expansion. Those are not realistic nor realizable objectives in the middle of the 20th century. We never will have peace in Asia on those terms.

But we can have a peace in Asia when control of Indochina is removed from the ideological conflict between this country and China. To do that will require international supervision and self-determination for Vietnam. To return to the Geneva accord offers some hope for ending the war. But it would require a return to the accord by the United States and South Vietnam, too. In the end I expect that we will settle for just that, but in the meantime we and the world may pass through a trial of bloodshed before we find out that American fortunes in Asia are no more achievable than were French, British, and Dutch fortunes before us.

Neither the United States nor North Vietnam now has much chance to settle this terrible war by bilateral negotiations. It has gone too far. It is going much further if a third force consisting of the nations of the world who are not now involved in the fighting is not brought to bear on this Asian crisis. That is why many of us who are urging a negotiated settlement with honor and security for all participants have recommended a formal presentation of the threat to world peace created by the war to the procedures of the United Nations.

Unless the nonparticipating nations come forward and live up to their clear obligations under international law, they are not likely to be nonparticipants much longer. Mankind can very well be on the brink of a third world war. Procedures of international law created by existing treaties do provide for the convening of an international peace conference on the crisis. I ask Great Britain, Canada, Japan, France, Russia, Italy, Belgium, Australia, New Zealand—yes, I ask all nations who profess that they want world peace—when, oh when, are you going to keep your obligations solemnly assumed by your signatures to existing treaties which provide for peaceful procedures for settling threats to peace? Is it your answer that they may not work? Then what is your alternative? War? The time has come for 85, 90, 95 and more nations to say to the United States and South Vietnam on the one hand and the Communist nations on the other who are jointly threatening the peace of the world: "We beg you to cease your fire and come to an International Conference Table."

Oh, I know the specter of Munich is immediately raised, and we are reminded that we could not do business with Hitler and it is better to fight now than later. But in all these comparisons with the years that led up to World War II, I never yet have heard anyone argue that the United States should, in 1938, have acted alone to send troops to Czechoslovakia to fight Germany. What the "Munich" criers have in mind for Munich is not that the negotiation should never have been held, but that a concert of nations should have acted together to serve notice and to take steps to stop further aggression. And that is what I am urging that we do in Vietnam.

The United States can accomplish nothing on the mainland of Asia so long as we are acting alone and in isolation from the large free nations of the area. To do so can mean nothing but perpetual war. Our present policy is not saving Asia from war or from communism, either, yet it compels our friends to choose between one or the other. That is not an acceptable alternative to the people of Asia or of the United States, and I am satisfied that we have much more to offer by way of leadership if we apply President Johnson's admonition to "Come, and reason together."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a further foundation for my discussion of the question of personal privilege I intend to raise, I ask unanimous consent that a selection of other lectures I have given on university campuses in opposition to the U.S. outlawry in South Vietnam be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the lectures were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE AT MOCK UNITED NATIONS ASSEMBLY, OHIO UNIVERSITY, ATHENS, OHIO, APRIL 10, 1965

The United Nations Charter was drafted in the closing days of World War II with one essential purpose in mind: to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

Twenty years later the nation most vitally interested and most energetic in creating and maintaining that organization is carrying on a war just as though the United Nations and its peacekeeping machinery did not exist. Like so many great powers before us, the United States has found that it is more convenient, more expedient, to ignore the procedures of international law and world organization when it considers its national interests threatened.

In his speech of Wednesday, President Johnson invoked the blessings of the United Nations and its Secretary General only to pick up the pieces of a war-wracked coun-

try, and then only after the combatants have decided to let the war end, if they should ever so decide.

What a mockery of the United Nations. What a shameful use of the U.N. and its Secretary General. What an admission that to the United States the U.N. Charter is nought but a scrap of paper to be invoked when it suits our purpose and to be ignored when it does not.

Our flouting of the U.N. Charter is going to lead the United States into a war in Asia that we cannot finish. Probably the Vietcong, the Chinese, and the Russians will not be able to finish it, either. But the fighting will cost many thousands more lives, perhaps millions, and the cost is incalculable. In fact, we know the administration cannot calculate the cost because it is seeking a provision in the current foreign aid bill that would give it unlimited, or what we call "open ended" authorization of funds for the war in Vietnam. So far, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has resisted this request in the hope of keeping at least a formal review power over the course of the war.

A second disaster, less costly in the immediate prospect but with frightening implications, will be the loss of our claim to leadership on behalf of morality and respect for law in world affairs. We have already lost the ability to call to account such countries as Indonesia for its aggressions against Malaysia, Greece, and Turkey for their threatening gestures over Cyprus, and Nasser for his participation in the civil war in the Yemen. As recently as April 6 of 1964, the U.S. Ambassador at the U.N. was able to present the American position on Yemen in these words: "My Government has repeatedly expressed its emphatic disapproval of provocative acts and retaliatory raids wherever they occur and by whomever committed. We believe that we all join in expressing our disapproval of the use of force by either side as a means of solving disputes, a principle which has been enshrined in the U.N. Charter."

When Nasser found it expedient to bomb a source of aid flowing to the royalist government in Yemen, and began air raids on Saudi Arabia, the United States joined in sending a U.N. force to the scene which operated long enough to end the air raids.

But in Vietnam, the U.N. Charter has been as thoroughly violated by the United States as by any country anywhere. And for the American people, the greatest tragedy of all is that the departure from the charter leads down a dark and violent road of which no man can see the end.

GOVERNING PROVISIONS OF U.N. CHARTER

The specific provisions of the charter that should guide our policy in Asia, as elsewhere, are these:

"Article 2, section 4: All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Other charter provisions are specific as to the duty of nations when they find themselves involved in a dispute. Article 33 states:

"SECTION 1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

Note that the sentence says "shall."

For 4 years, the United States has been participating in the fighting in South Vietnam in disregard of that provision, and for 2 months we bombed North Vietnam in violation of that provision.

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8155

On Wednesday of this week, the President for the first time used the words "unconditional discussions." He did not, however, suggest them or call for them, or invite anyone to such discussions. He said only we "remain ready" for them. This presumes that someone else will organize them, set them up, and invite us to take part. Who, where, when, and how are not mentioned. Meantime, it is clear that the war will continue unabated.

That puts in violation of article 37 which states:

"Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that article, they shall refer it to the Security Council."

These provisions do not relate only to members of the organization. They relate to "parties to a dispute." Other sections of the charter make provision for jurisdiction over parties who are not U.N. members. Our contention that because North and South Vietnam and China are not U.N. members makes these obligations inoperative is utterly untrue.

It is commonly said both in and out of government that the U.N. is a waste of time and that the Communists understand nothing but force. However, the line continues, at some future date we may find it in our interest to go to the U.N.

This supposedly sophisticated argument ignores several points.

First, it may not be left to us to decide whether and when the Vietnam war should go to that body. Article 34 provides: "The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

The Security Council is self-starting in such matters.

Second, article 35 provides: "Any member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in article 34 to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly."

This means that if we wait for another country to invoke article 35, we can be sure it will not be in terms and under conditions most favorable to us.

Our present argument against going to the U.N. is purely one of international power politics, and an unrealistic one at that. It contends that because neither North Vietnam nor Red China is in the U.N., the Soviet Union will become the spokesman for the rebel Vietcong, thus driving Russia into closer collaboration with China, North Vietnam, and the Vietcong.

But it is our bombing that is doing that. It is the air raids on the north that are forcing the Soviet Union to involve itself directly in the war by sending air defense missiles to Hanoi, to be manned initially at least, by the Russians. The longer the war continues and the more it is escalated to destroy North Vietnam, the more Russia and China are going to try to outdo each other in coming to the aid of North Vietnam.

The longer this struggle goes on, the more unified the Communist camp is going to be, and the more isolated the United States is going to be. That is the real fruit of our war policy and the most dangerous for the American people.

UNITED STATES ISOLATED IN ASIA

The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization was established in 1955 to permit concerted action to maintain peace in that part of the world. It got off to a bad start when the major Asian countries declined to take part. India, Japan, and Indonesia, in particular, are notable for their absence from SEATO. And in recent years, Pakistan, the only significant local member, has increasingly neutralized itself in all cold war matters. Of

the eight members only two small Asian countries, Thailand and the Philippines, can be viewed as active participants. Australia and New Zealand are Asian, but they are white, and therein lies our essential difficulty.

Only Australia, of all SEATO members, has contributed to the Vietnam war with active participants, and these number only about 160 men. Small Filipino and South Korean units are noncombatant. While Thailand has urged us on in Vietnam, there are no Thais doing any fighting there, nor are there any British, New Zealand, French, or Pakistani forces.

That is how our SEATO allies feel about fighting in Vietnam.

Although India is the one country of Asia most threatened by China, even India has no desire to see a war break out, because in conditions of war between the United States and China, nuclear weapons will be used. Moreover, India knows that in war, nations lose control of events and are controlled by the exigencies of the war more than the other way around.

Prime Minister Shastri of India continues to urge us to seek a negotiated settlement.

Even more indicative of our failure to convince even our friends of the rightness of our policy has been the action of Japan in sending a senior diplomat to southeast Asia to make his own assessment of the war and of American policy. Prime Minister Sato sent his personal emissary after Japanese press and public opinion failed completely to endorse the American military action.

And his report has been that less than 30 percent of the Vietcong are Communist, that the Vietcong has not been shown to be controlled by Communist China or the Soviet Union or by North Vietnam, and that the United States was greatly mistaken in thinking that military force would solve the matter.

Perhaps some improvement in the reception by these countries of our actions in Vietnam will result from the President's speech. But when no change results, when the raids on the north are increased to include civilian targets, as they will be, then the United States is going to find itself openly opposed throughout Asia.

The President's speech is being described as the carrot that goes with the stick, the offer, and the promise to go with the use of force. Presumably, the air raids on the north were designed to force North Vietnam to a conference table more or less on our terms.

Now, so the argument goes, we can say that we have offered to negotiate a peace and if the offer is not accepted, it is the fault of someone else, not the United States.

Yet 2 months ago, when the air raids on the north began, American voices were saying that we had to step up our military activity so that we could bargain at the conference table from a position of strength. How often that phrase has been thrown out in Washington in the last few months. But I have never heard any explanation of why it is a policy that only our side could or should adopt.

Is anyone going to say now that North Vietnam should not undertake any negotiations from a position of weakness, but should increase her own military activity so that when any negotiations do begin, she can bargain from a position of strength?

I heard nothing in the President's speech that suggests to me he has any negotiations in mind at all. There was a lot of lipservice paid to the theory of peace, grandiose utopian verbiage was plentiful, and the dollar sign was liberally displayed, apparently in hopes of quieting the criticism from abroad. But there was no language that suggested that the United States is going to return to the rule of law in southeast Asia or that we are actively seeking a peaceful solution to its problems. There was no word that the

United States plans henceforth to observe either the United Nations Charter or the Geneva agreement of 1954.

All I heard in the President's speech was that the United States is going to continue shooting fish in the barrel until they are all dead.

In short, what the President did not say was far more meaningful and significant than what he did say. He did not mention the peace-keeping functions and duties of the United Nations, nor the obligations of the United States under the United Nations Charter. He did not mention that South Vietnam refused to hold the elections of 1956 which were supposed to reunite Vietnam under one government. The most meaningful negotiations that could be held with the North are those that were supposed to have taken place in 1956 to decide the details of a countrywide election.

When are we going to conduct those negotiations? The President is quite wrong in thinking that he can call upon others to observe the 1954 agreement while at the same time he insists that South Vietnam must be guaranteed as an independent nation. The 1954 agreement did not create a sovereign South Vietnam. It created one Vietnam, divided into two zones, to be reunited within 2 years by elections supervised by the International Control Commission. If the President wants an independent South Vietnam, he must negotiate a new agreement. If he wants the old agreement observed, then he must go ahead with the reunifying of Vietnam under one government. But we cannot have it both ways unless we are expecting only to use this line as an excuse for war, and that is how we have been using it for 10 years.

Most of all do I regret the reference the President made to the United Nations and its Secretary General. Clearly, the President sought to invoke the sanctity of the United Nations while at the same time repudiating its most vital function—that of keeping the peace. I say to the President that U Thant could use the prestige of his office, and his deep knowledge of Asia, to initiate peace talks. The good offices of the Secretary General are infinitely more meaningful to peace than they are to the presiding over of a billion-dollar development program. Surely the President well knows that peace must come to that area before any kind of development plan can succeed.

When are we going to make use of the United Nations and of the Secretary General for the one purpose they were created to serve—to save mankind from the scourge of war?

Unfortunately, the American policy in Asia is not saving mankind from war nor from communism, either. And I fear that to continue the war, as we have been doing, is going to help communism make even more gains in Asia, because our policy tells the people of Asia that we would rather see them dead than see them live under Communist control. We are fast killing them. The Pentagon keeps records of how many civilians in the South are killed by Vietcong terrorists, but it says it has no record of how many civilians in the South are being killed by napalm and the other weapons of war being used by American and government forces. But the people know. And if our raids on the North bring down upon South Vietnam the organized force of the North Vietnamese army, all of southeast Asia will be swallowed up in a war for which this country must assume major responsibility, and which we will have to fight alone.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA
(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., Mar. 15, 1965)

Last summer and fall, many voices were raised by American politicians and by the

political generals of South Vietnam to "go north." The war in South Vietnam was being lost. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, one of the passing parade of Vietnamese leaders, was anxious that the losses in the south be covered by expansion of the war into North Vietnam by the United States. A presidential campaign was being conducted in the United States almost entirely on the issue of who was placing his faith in military power to solve all our problems and who was not.

On September 28, 1964, at Manchester, N.H., President Lyndon Johnson said of all this: "So just for the moment I have not thought that we were ready for American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. What I have been trying to do, with the situation that I found, was to get the boys in Vietnam to do their own fighting with our advice and with our equipment. That is the course we are following. So we are not going north and drop bombs at this stage of the game, and we are not going south and run out and leave it for the Communists to take over. We have lost 190 American lives, and to each one of those 190 families this is a major war. We lost that many in Texas on the Fourth of July in wrecks. But I often wake up in the night and think about how many I could lose if I made a misstep. When we retaliated in the Tonkin Gulf, we dropped bombs on their nests where they had their PT boats housed, and we dropped them within 35 miles of the Chinese border. I don't know what you would think if they started dropping them 35 miles from your border, but I think that that is something you have to take into consideration.

"So we are not going north and we are not going south; we are going to continue to try to get them to save their own freedom with their own men, with our leadership and our officer direction, and such equipment as we can furnish them. We think that losing 190 lives in the period that we have been out there is bad, but it is not like 190,000 that we might lose the first month if we escalated that war. So we are trying somehow to evolve a way, as we have in some other places, where the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists finally, after getting worn down, conclude that they will leave their neighbors alone, and if they do we will come home tomorrow."

Time after time, the spokesmen for the administration told the public and told congressional committees in private that what was going on in South Vietnam was essentially a civil war. The outside aid was put at somewhere between 10 and 20 percent of the rebels in numbers. Weapons were described as coming primarily from capture of government sources, with perhaps 10 percent brought in from outside South Vietnam.

For these reasons, it was maintained that there was little to be gained by bombing North Vietnam or even the trails leading through Laos into the South. How often did you hear it said that the battle had to be fought and won in South Vietnam?

Yet last month all these policy statements of why expansion of the war would serve no purpose were thrown out by the same people who had made them. Something called a white paper was published by the State Department to coincide with the change in policy. But this white paper did not afford any explanation or any reason or any justification of a change in policy.

What it did in fact was to confirm and verify what we have been told so many times: that somewhere between 10 and 20 percent of the number and about 10 percent of the weapons of the Vietcong rebels come from outside South Vietnam.

That is what the white paper confirms. That is all. It does not even claim that the war is any less a civil war than it ever was. It describes the weapons and it tells where they were found. It cites a grand total of 179

guns of all kinds, including pistols, that were captured from the Vietcong in 1962 and 1963 and which were manufactured in Communist countries. But we already know that some 10,000 weapons were lost by the government to the Vietcong in approximately the same period, and some 7,000 to 8,000 weapons were captured from them.

The white paper estimates that a maximum of 37,100 infiltrators entered South Vietnam from the north from 1959 through 1964. Yet with the known casualties and the estimated current guerrilla force, these men from the north still constitute at most 20 percent of the Vietcong. The confirmed infiltrators constitute only 12 percent.

Moreover, of the men captured and used as exhibits in the white paper, many were natives of the south. Seven were captured in 1962, eleven in 1963, and five in 1964.

In other words, everything in the white paper with the sole exception of the boat sunk on February 15 of this year was known to the administration last summer and last fall when the President said "we are not going north," and when both the Pentagon and the State Department insisted that no useful purpose would be served in the south by attacking the north.

And today it is still just as true as it was then that the Vietcong rebellion is essentially a South Vietnamese affair in personnel and weapons. The stories of the captured men were the same and were known in 1962 and 1963. The captured weapons were the same and were known in 1962 and 1963.

To put them in a white paper in March of 1965 and call them a justification for expanding the war now when they weren't before, is an insult to the intelligence of the entire world, not to mention the Americans. I suppose this is why five very able and prominent men in the intellectual world hired most of a page in the Washington Post March 12 to reprint a devastation of the white paper called "White Paper on Vietnam. What Does It Prove?" The men are Robert S. Browne, formerly a high ranking U.S. aid official in Cambodia and South Vietnam; Benjamin Cohen, once high in the councils of the Roosevelt administration and later the State Department; Lewis Mumford from the world of arts and letters; Hans Morgenthau, perhaps our most prominent political scientist in the field of international relations from the University of Chicago; and Dr. Bryant Wedge, Director of the Institute for the Study of National Behavior at Princeton.

The article these gentlemen sponsored first appeared in the New Republic and concludes: "The white paper fails to sustain its two major contentions, that there is large, militarily crucial infiltration of both men and material from Hanoi."

REASON FOR POLICY CHANGE

The white paper does prove one thing. It proves that the war we had been sustaining in South Vietnam, the effort to retain that area as a Western bastion, was a failure. The Taylor-McNamara program for Vietnam, announced on so many visits to that country by these men, was rapidly going down the drain. Despite aid running in the magnitude of \$700 million a year, despite the presence of American military strength that began at 680 and rose steadily to 23,000, despite absolute control of the air including helicopters to rush troops to any trouble spot, and despite military equipment of many kinds that were completely in violation of the Geneva agreement, our men in Saigon were losing.

More and more territory was being lost to the rebels, and the political turmoil in the capital reached the point where there was no government at all worthy of the name.

It became clear that something else had to be done. And to the men who have always believed in a military solution to everything,

the answer was to increase our military activity.

So we began bombing targets in North Vietnam. Clearly, this was not done with the idea that it would have a direct effect upon the capacity of the rebels to fight in the south, because that contention had been thoroughly disposed of last year. The purpose of the bombing was ostensibly to inflict damage upon North Vietnam that could be called off in return for the Vietcong calling off their war in the south.

I do not doubt for a moment that President Johnson is sincere in his belief that this is a real possibility. But I am satisfied that there are many in the high office of the Pentagon and the State Department who know perfectly well that the only result of such a policy will be the steady expansion of the war throughout all the old colony of Indochina, the steady increase in the use of American air and naval power, and the steady funneling of more and more American troops into southeast Asia.

The white paper is the signal for a new war, because we could not win the one that was already going on.

The committing of 3,500 marines to ground combat is only the first installment of U.S. ground forces that will be needed. I am satisfied that what is behind our expansion of the war is a design to match our half million ground forces in Europe with half a million in Asia, to act as the trip-wire that would bring the full American nuclear power to bear upon China should she make any move to support local governments.

That is the direction we are now taking in Asia. It is the direction of singlehanded U.S. containment not only of China but of all political movements that seek to remove Western influences from southeast Asia. No longer do we propose to organize groupings of friendly countries to act in concert, such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. No longer do we plan to seek the concerted action of our Western allies.

We are now committed to "going it alone" and putting American soldiers into Asia on whatever scale needed to carry out this objective.

The pretense that we are in South Vietnam to help the people win a fight for freedom has been entirely dropped. From now on, the war will be conducted by Americans, under American command, for American objectives. It is obvious that no internal political force within South Vietnam will be allowed to reach a position of power except with American approval. And it will be the strategic interests of the United States, as we see them, that will determine the course of the war.

I am satisfied that this in large part explains the President's anxiety about public debate, and his implied rebukes to Members of Congress who continue raising questions and objections to what we are doing. I am satisfied that the President understands the inherent fallacies in his presumption that we can bring the Vietcong to heel by bombing North Vietnam. He knows the American people will understand these fallacies, too, if there is any discussion in depth of Asian affairs. He surely recognizes that he is now dependent upon the good faith of both North Vietnam and China not to respond to our escalation of the war with an escalation of their own.

His announced policy requires North Vietnam to stop aiding the rebels, it requires the Vietcong to collapse as a result, and it requires stability to emerge in South Vietnam, all as a result of these bombings. The likelihood of any of these things happening is so remote that I do not wonder at the massive campaign with the press and Members of Congress to support what is being done without raising questions or objections.

The failure of this policy, too, will soon emerge. The New York Times already re-

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8157

ports a frank recognition, in private, by administration officials that the bombings have not had any effect upon the war in the south and they are now considering what new force to bring to bear upon North Vietnam.

Presumably, this new force will take the form of bombing industrial targets further to the north, instead of military installations in the southern part of North Vietnam.

When that doesn't help, either, I expect that the next step will be the landing of thousands more ground combat troops to engage the rebels directly.

REACTION OF OTHER NATIONS KEY TO FUTURE

How much further this entanglement will go will depend, in my opinion, entirely upon the reaction of other nations. The easy acceptance by Prime Minister Wilson of the white paper excuse strengthens belief in the report he and the President have agreed to go along with whatever the other does in southeast Asia. British shipping in North Vietnam apparently will not be mentioned by the United States so long as Mr. Wilson does not object to our bombing of North Vietnam.

Ten years ago, it was the refusal of Britain to join us that kept us out of Indochina because President Eisenhower did not propose to get into a unilateral war there. But there were many other trouble spots 10 years ago, especially in Europe, that also restrained us from excessive unilateral entanglement in Asia. Today, tensions with the Soviet Union are sufficiently relaxed to encourage many of our policymakers to think we are free to fight in Asia without worrying too much about what Russia will do.

They are counting on Russia leaving us to tangle with North Vietnam and China while she remains quiescent not only in Asia but everywhere. They are also counting on Japan, India, the Philippines and the other nations of the area to remain silent spectators to a war in their midst. And they are counting on both North Vietnam and China to submit to American bombings without committing their own major military force, which is manpower.

Any change from what is expected of them on the part of these countries could alter our own policy. We have already heard Pope Paul, the United Nations Secretary General, and now the World Council of Churches call upon us to negotiate our problems in Asia rather than make war over them. It is a sad fact to contemplate that the American people and the American Congress have abandoned their international responsibilities to a small handful of men in the executive branch of our Government. For the moment, at least, they have chosen to let the President decide, and to make his choice not on the basis of full public debate and discussion but on advice from the same group of men whose advice on Vietnam for the last 4 years has been totally wrong.

I hope that this silence on the part of the American public and its Congress will not continue. If it does, that silence will be broken not by wisdom but by casualty lists. I understand that President Johnson is telling visitors that Bob Taft based his opposition to the Korean war on the failure of President Truman to keep leading Republicans advised of his actions. President Johnson presumably does not intend to make that mistake.

But I hope he is not deluding himself with the idea that the revulsion of the American people to the Korean war stemmed from Truman's failure to advise Bob Taft and other leading Members of Congress.

It is not a cozy visit to the White House that will head off disaster for a Democratic President. Only a sound policy can do that, and a sound policy must be one that protects and conserves American lives by limiting our vital interests to those that can reasonably be defended.

I do not suggest that South Vietnam is not of interest to us. But it is not the kind of vital interest that deserves to be protected by American blood. It is the kind of interest that should be the subject of discussion with other affected nations and there are many nations that are even more vitally affected there than we are.

That is why I continue to hope that the President will respond to U Thant's appeal for negotiations under United Nations auspices. And above all, I hope that the American people will bestir themselves to examine the implications of our present course in Asia, and make their voices heard in support of U Thant, Pope Paul, and the Council of Churches. Otherwise, we stand to awaken only when we are being drenched in blood and for an objective that is not shared by any of our allies or even by those nations in Asia whose really vital interests are at stake.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I warn the American people that a propaganda drive has been started by spokesmen for the Johnson administration to interfere with one of their most precious, fundamental liberties and freedoms, namely, the right of freemen to criticize their government. That does not mean that those of us who criticize our Government in regard to this outlawry in Asia, as we see it, question the sincerity of the spokesmen for this administration. We question only their judgment. We also deplore the fact that they are not telling the American people the facts about the record and the policies of the United States in southeast Asia.

So I wish to refer briefly to a speech of propaganda delivered by the Secretary of State of the United States last Saturday night. I ask unanimous consent that that speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FRIDAY, APRIL 23, 1965

I

When this distinguished society was founded 59 years ago, the then Secretary of State, Elihu Root, became its first president. Within the passage of time, the Secretary of State has been elevated to a less demanding role, that of honorary president. Secretary Root himself not only established the precedent of becoming president while Secretary of State; he also superseded it by continuing to serve as your president for 18 years. The proceedings of the first meeting indicate that Secretary Root not only presided and delivered an address, but that he also selected the menu for the dinner.

The year 1907, when the first of the society's annual meetings was held, today appears to have been one of those moments in American history when we were concentrating upon building our American society, essentially untroubled by what took place beyond our borders. But the founders of this society realized that the United States could not remain aloof from the world. It is one of the achievements of this society that, from its inception, it has spread the realization that the United States cannot drop out of the community of nations—that international affairs are part of our national affairs.

Questions of war and peace occupied the society at its first meeting. Among the subjects discussed were the possibility of the

immunity of private property from belligerent seizure upon the high seas and whether trade in contraband of war was unneutral. Limitations upon recourse to force then proposed were embryonic, as is illustrated by the fact one topic for discussion related to restrictions upon the use of armed force in the collection of contract obligations. The distance between those ideas and the restrictions upon recourse to armed force contained in the Charter of the United Nations is vast. It is to these charter restrictions—and their place in the practice and malpractice of states—that I shall address much of my remarks this evening.

II

Current U.S. policy arouses the criticism that it is at once too legal and too tough. Time was when the criticism of American concern with the legal element in international relations was that it led to softness—to a "legalistic-moralistic" approach to foreign affairs which conformed more to the ideal than to the real. Today, criticism of American attachment to the role of law is that it leads not to softness, but to severity. We are criticized not for sacrificing our national interests to international interests, but for endeavoring to impose the international interest upon other nations. We are criticized for acting as if the Charter of the United Nations means what it says. We are criticized for treating the statement of the law by the International Court of Justice as authoritative. We are criticized for taking collective security seriously.

This criticism is, I think, a sign of strength—of our strength, and of the strength of international law. It is a tribute to a blending of political purpose with legal ethic.

American foreign policy is at once principled and pragmatic. Its central objective is our national safety and well-being—to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." But we know we can no longer find security and well-being in defenses and policies which are confined to North America, or the Western Hemisphere, or the North Atlantic Community. This has become a very small planet. We have to be concerned with all of it—with all of its land, waters, atmosphere, and with surrounding space. We have a deep national interest in peace, the prevention of aggression, the faithful performance of agreements, the growth of international law. Our foreign policy is rooted in the profoundly practical realization that the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter must animate the behavior of states, if mankind is to prosper or is even to survive. Or at least they must animate enough states with enough will and enough resources to see to it that others do not violate those rules with impunity.

The preamble and articles 1 and 2 of the charter set forth abiding purposes of American policy. This is not surprising, since we took the lead in drafting the charter—at a time when the biggest war in history was still raging and we and others were thinking deeply about its frightful costs and the ghastly mistakes and miscalculations which led to it.

The kind of world we seek is the kind set forth in the opening sections of the charter: a world community of independent states, each with the institutions of its own choice, but cooperating with one another to promote their mutual welfare, a world in which the use of force is effectively inhibited, a world of expanding human rights and well-being, a world of expanding international law, a world in which an agreement is a commitment and not just a tactic.

We believe that this is the sort of world a great majority of the governments of the world desire. We believe it is the sort of

world man must achieve if he is not to perish. As I said on another occasion: "If once the rule of international law could be discussed with a certain condescension as a utopian ideal, today it becomes an elementary practical necessity. *Pacta sunt servanda* now becomes the basis for survival."

Unhappily a minority of governments is committed to different ideas of the conduct and organization of human affairs. They are dedicated to the promotion of the Communist world revolution. And their doctrine justifies any technique, any ruse, any deceit, which contributes to that end. They may differ as to tactics from time to time. And the two principal Communist powers are competitors for the leadership of the world Communist movement. But both are committed to the eventual communication of the entire world.

The overriding issue of our time is which concepts are to prevail: those set forth in the United Nations Charter or those proclaimed in the name of a world revolution.

III

The paramount commitment of the charter is article 2, paragraph 4, which reads: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

This comprehensive limitation went beyond the Covenant of the League of Nations. This more sweeping commitment sought to apply a bitter lesson of the interwar period—that the threat of use or force, whether or not called war, feeds on success. The indelible lesson of those years is that the time to stop aggression is at its very beginning.

The exceptions to the prohibitions on the use or threat of force were expressly set forth in the charter. The use of force is legal: as a collective measure by the United Nations, or as action by regional agencies in accordance with chapter VIII of the charter, or in individual or collective self-defense.

When article 2, paragraph 4 was written it was widely regarded as general international law, governing both members and nonmembers of the United Nations. And on the universal reach of the principle embodied in article 2, paragraph 4, wide agreement remains. Thus, last year, a United Nations Special Committee on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States met in Mexico City. All shades of United Nations opinion were represented. The Committee's purpose was to study and possibly to elaborate certain of those principles. The Committee debated much and agreed on little. But on one point, it reached swift and unanimous agreement: that all states, and not only all members of the United Nations, are bound to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. Nonrecognition of the statehood of a political entity was held not to affect the international application of this cardinal rule of general international law.

But at this same meeting in Mexico City, Czechoslovakia, with the warm support of the Soviet Union and some other members, proposed formally another exemption from the limitations on use of force. Their proposal stated that: "The prohibition of the use of force shall not affect . . . self-defense of nations against colonial domination in the exercise of the right of self-determination."

The United States is all for self-defense. We are against colonial domination—we led the way in throwing it off. We have long favored self-determination, in practice as well as in words—indeed, we favor it for the entire world, including the peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. But we could not accept the Czech proposal. And

we were pleased that the Special Committee found the Czech proposal unacceptable.

The primary reason why we opposed that attempt to rewrite the charter—apart from the inadmissibility of rewriting the charter at all by such means—was that we knew the meaning behind the words. We knew that like so many statements from such sources, it used upside down language—that it would in effect authorize a state to wage war, to use force internationally, as long it claimed it was doing so to liberate somebody from colonial domination. In short, the Czech resolution proposed to give to so-called wars on national liberation the same exemption from the limitation on the use of force which the charter accords to defense against aggression.

What is a war of national liberation? It is, in essence, any war which furthers the Communist world revolution—what, in broader terms, the Communists have long referred to as a just war. The term "war of national liberation" is used not only to denote armed insurrection by people still under colonial rule—there are not many of those left outside the Communist world. It is used to denote any effort led by Communists to overthrow by force any non-Communist government.

Thus the war in South Vietnam is called a war of national liberation. And those who would overthrow various other non-Communist governments in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are called the forces of national liberation.

Nobody in his right mind would deny that Venezuela is not only a truly independent nation but that it has a government chosen in a free election. But the leaders of the Communist insurgency in Venezuela are described as leaders of a fight for national liberation—not only by themselves and by Castro and the Chinese Communists, but by the Soviet Communists.

A recent editorial in Pravda spoke of the peoples of Latin American . . . marching firmly along the path of struggle for their national independence and said: "the upsurge of the national liberation movement in Latin American countries has been to a great extent a result of the activities of Communist parties." It added: "The Soviet people have regarded and still regard it as their sacred duty to give support to the peoples fighting for their independence. True to their international duty the Soviet people have been and will remain on the side of the Latin American patriots."

In Communist doctrine and practice, a non-Communist government may be labeled and denounced as "colonialist," "reactionary," or a "puppet," and any state so labeled by the Communists automatically becomes fair game . . . while Communist intervention by force in non-Communist states is justified as "self-defense" or part of the "struggle against colonial domination." "Self-determination" seems to mean that any Communist nation can determine by itself that any non-Communist state is a victim of colonialist domination and therefore a justifiable target for a war of "liberation."

As the risks of overt aggression, whether nuclear or with conventional forces, have become increasingly evident, the Communists have put increasing stress on the "war of national liberation." The Chinese Communists have been more militant in language and behavior than the Soviet Communists. But the Soviet Communist leadership also has consistently proclaimed its commitment in principle to support wars of national liberation. This commitment was reaffirmed as recently as Monday of this week by Mr. Kosygin.

International law does not restrict internal revolution within a state, or revolution against colonial authority. But international law does restrict what third powers may lawfully do in support of insurrection. It

is these restrictions which are challenged by the doctrine, and violated by the practice, of "wars of liberation."

It is plain that acceptance of the doctrine of "wars of liberation" would amount to scuttling the modern international law of peace which the charter prescribes. And acceptance of the practice of "wars of liberation," as defined by the Communists, would mean the breakdown of peace itself.

IV

Vietnam presents a clear current case of the lawful versus the unlawful use of force. I would agree with General Giap and other Communists that it is a test case for "wars of national liberation." We intend to meet that test.

Were the insurgency in South Vietnam truly indigenous and self-sustained, international law would not be involved. But the fact is that it receives vital external support—in organization and direction, in training, in men, in weapons and other supplies. That external support is unlawful, for a double reason. First, it contravenes general international law, which the United Nations Charter here expresses. Second, it contravenes particular international law: The 1954 Geneva accords on Vietnam, and the 1962 Geneva agreements on Laos.

In resisting the aggression against it, the Republic of Vietnam is exercising its right of self-defense. It called upon us and other states for assistance. And in the exercise of the right of collective self-defense under the United Nations Charter, we and other nations are providing such assistance.

The American policy of assisting South Vietnam to maintain its freedom was inaugurated under President Eisenhower, and continued under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Our assistance has been increased because the aggression from the North has been augmented. Our assistance now encompasses the bombing of North Vietnam. The bombing is designed to interdict, as far as possible, and to inhibit, as far as may be necessary, continued aggression against the Republic of Vietnam.

When that aggression ceases, collective measures in defense against it will cease. As President Johnson has declared: "If that aggression is stopped, the people and government of South Vietnam will be free to settle their own future, and the need for supporting American military action there will end."

The fact that the demarcation line between North and South Vietnam was intended to be temporary does not make the assault on South Vietnam any less of an aggression. The demarcation lines between North and South Korea and between East and West Germany are temporary. But that did not make the North Korean invasion of South Korea a permissible use of force.

Let's not forget the salient features of the 1962 agreements of Laos. Laos was to be independent and neutral. All foreign troops, regular or irregular, and other military personnel were to be withdrawn within 75 days, except a limited number of French instructors as requested by the Lao Government. No arms were to be introduced into Laos except at the request of that Government. The signatories agreed to refrain "from all direct or indirect interference in the internal affairs" of Laos. They promised also not to use Lao territory to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries—a stipulation that plainly prohibited the passage of arms and men from North Vietnam to South Vietnam by way of Laos. An International Control Commission of three was to assure compliance with the agreements. And all the signatories promised to support a coalition government under Prince Souvanna Phouma.

What happened? The non-Communist elements complied. The Communists did not. At no time since that agreement was signed have either the Pathet Lao or the

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8159

North Vietnam authorities complied with it. The North Vietnamese left several thousand troops there—the backbone of almost every Pathet Lao battalion. Use of the corridor through Laos to South Vietnam continued. And the Communists barred the areas under their control both to the Government of Laos and the International Control Commission.

To revert to Vietnam: I continue to hear and see nonsense about the nature of the struggle there. I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to learn—especially to learn how to think.

Hanoi has never made a secret of its designs. It publicly proclaimed in 1960 a renewal of the assault on South Vietnam. Quite obviously its hopes of taking over South Vietnam from within had withered to close to zero—and the remarkable economic and social progress of South Vietnam contrasted, most disagreeably for the North Vietnamese Communists, with their own miserable economic performance.

The facts about the external involvement have been documented in white papers and other publications of the Department of State. The International Control Commission has held that there is evidence "beyond reasonable doubt" of North Vietnamese intervention.

There is no evidence that the Vietcong has any significant popular following in South Vietnam. It relies heavily on terror. Most of its reinforcements in recent months have been North Vietnamese from the North Vietnamese Army.

Let us be clear about what is involved today in southeast Asia. We are not involved with empty phrases or conceptions which ride upon the clouds. We are talking about the vital national interests of the United States in the peace of the Pacific. We are talking about the appetite for aggression—an appetite which grows upon feeding and which is proclaimed to be insatiable. We are talking about the safety of nations with whom we are allied—and the integrity of the American commitment to join in meeting attack. It is true that we also believe that every small state has a right to be unmolested by its neighbors even though it is within reach of a great power. It is true that we are committed to general principles of law and procedure which reject the idea that men and arms can be sent freely across frontiers to absorb a neighbor. But underlying the general principles is the harsh reality that our own security is threatened by those who would embark upon a course of aggression whose announced ultimate purpose is our own destruction. Once again we hear expressed the views which cost the men of my generation a terrible price in World War II. We are told that southeast Asia is far away—but so were Manchuria and Ethiopia. We are told that if we insist that someone stop shooting that that is asking them for unconditional surrender. We are told that perhaps the aggressor will be content with just one more bite. We are told that if we prove faithless on one commitment that perhaps others would believe us about other commitments in other places. We are told that if we stop resisting that perhaps the other side will have a change of heart. We were asked to stop hitting bridges and radar sites and ammunition depots without requiring that the other side stop its slaughter of thousands of civilians and its bombings of schools and hotels and hospitals and railways and buses.

Surely we have learned over the past three decades that the acceptance of aggression leads only to a sure catastrophe. Surely we have learned that the aggressor must face the consequences of his action and be saved from the frightful miscalculation that brings all to ruin. It is the purpose of law to guide

men away from such events, to establish rules of conduct which are deeply rooted in the reality of experience.

v

Before closing, I should like to turn away from the immediate difficulties and dangers of the situation in southeast Asia and remind you of the dramatic progress that shapes and is being shaped by expanding international law.

A "common law of mankind"—to use the happy phrase of your distinguished colleague, Wilfred Jenks—is growing as the world shrinks, and as the vistas of space expand. This year is, by proclamation of the General Assembly, International Cooperation Year, a year "to direct attention to the common interests of mankind and to accelerate the joint efforts being undertaken to further them." Those common interests are enormous and intricate, and the joint efforts which further them are developing fast, although perhaps not fast enough.

In the 19th century, the United States attended an average of one international conference a year. Now we attend nearly 600 a year. We are party to 4,300 treaties and other international agreements in force. Three-fourths of these were signed in the last 25 years. Our interest in the observance of all of these treaties and agreements is profound, whether the issue is peace in Laos, or the payment of the United Nations assessments, or the allocation of radio frequencies, or the application of airline safeguards, or the control of illicit traffic in narcotics, or any other issue which States have chosen to regulate through the lawmaking process. The writing of international cooperation into international law is meaningful only if the law is obeyed—and only if the international institutions which administer and develop the law function in accordance with agreed procedures, until the procedures are changed.

Everything suggests that the rate of growth in international law—like the rate of change in almost every other field these days—is rising at a very steep angle.

In recent years the law of the sea has been developed and codified—but it first evolved in a leisurely fashion over the centuries. International agreements to regulate aerial navigation had to be worked out within the period of a couple of decades. Now, within the first few years of man's adventures in outer space, we are deeply involved in the creation of international institutions, regulations, and law to govern this effort.

Already the United Nations has developed a set of legal principles to govern the use of outer space and declared celestial bodies free from national appropriation.

Already nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, have agreed not to orbit weapons of mass destruction in outer space.

Already the Legal Subcommittee of the United Nations Committee on Outer Space is formulating international agreements on liability for damage caused by the reentry of objects launched into outer space and on rescue and return of astronauts and space objects.

Already the first international sounding rocket range has been established in India and is being offered for United Nations sponsorship.

To make orderly space exploration possible at this stage, the International Telecommunications Union had to allocate radio frequencies for the purpose.

To take advantage of weather reporting and forecasting potential of observation satellites, married to computer technology, the World Meteorological Organization is creating a vast system of data acquisition, analysis, and distribution which depends entirely on international agreement, regulation, and standards.

And to start building a single global communications satellite system, we have created

a novel international institution in which a private American corporation shares ownership with 45 governments.

This is but part of the story of how the pace of discovery and invention forces us to reach out for international agreement, to build international institutions, to do things in accordance with an expanding international and transnational law.

Phenomenal as the growth of treaty obligations is, the true innovation of 20th century international law lies more in the fact that we have nearly 80 international institutions which are capable of carrying out those obligations.

It is important that the processes and products of international cooperation be understood and appreciated; and it is important that their potential be much further developed. It is also important that the broader significance of the contributions of international cooperation to the solving of international problems of an economic, social, scientific, and humanitarian character not be overestimated. For all the progress of peace could be incinerated in war.

Thus the control force in international relations remains the paramount problem which confronts the diplomat and the lawyer—and the main in the street and the man in the ricefield. Most of mankind is not in an immediate position to grapple very directly with that problem, but the problem is no less crucial. The responsibility of those, in your profession and mine, who do grapple with it is the greater. I am happy to acknowledge that this society, in thinking and debating courageously and constructively about the conditions of peace, continues to make its unique contribution and to make it well.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is perfectly obvious what the Secretary of State would like to see. It is perfectly obvious what other spokesmen for this administration, whose statements I shall comment upon shortly, would like to see. They would like to see us go silent. They would like to see the critics of the Johnson administration policy in Asia go silent. But let me say to the Johnson administration that no matter how many attacks they make on the senior Senator from Oregon, no matter how many attacks of the likes of the propaganda that was issued this morning by a spokesman for this administration, my lips will not be closed. I intend to continue to carry to the American people what I honestly believe to be the facts about the wrong policy of the Johnson administration in making war in Asia on a unilateral basis, completely outside the framework of international law, and in violation of one treaty after another to which the signature of the United States is affixed. I tell the American people today, as I said in Eugene, Oreg., last Friday night, that if the Johnson administration continues its present warmaking policy in Asia, the probabilities are that 12 months from now there will be several hundred thousand boys fighting and dying in Asia. That is my conviction.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I, too, have sat through briefings. On the basis of those briefings, I see no other result than an all-out massive war in Asia. That war will kill hundreds of thousands of American boys. The time to stop that war is now. It can be stopped honorably if the administration will face up to the ugly realities that confront the

world. It can be stopped now if our allies, who are giving us all words of encouragement but none of the men to join in doing the dying in Asia, will live up to the signatures on treaties that they signed. I mean specifically such countries as Canada, to the north, Great Britain, France, Italy, and our other NATO allies. I mean every nation that has affixed its signature to the Charter of the United Nations, because every nation that has affixed its signature to that charter and has not carried out its obligation to that charter by seeking to bring the procedures of the charter into effect to try to stop the war in Asia, to preserve the peace of the world, is violating its international treaty obligations.

It is very interesting to read the statement of the Secretary of State in a shocking speech last Saturday night. Apparently the speech is a part of the effort of this administration to drive criticism of its policies underground, because it charges that some of those who speak against the administration are appeasers, in some way, aiding and abetting Communists.

I say to McNamara and to Rusk, I say to President Johnson: "Not a single one of you hates communism more than does the senior Senator from Oregon; but I completely disagree with your judgment as to how you believe the Communist threat can be handled. The Communist threat cannot be handled successfully with war. The Communist threat cannot be handled successfully with bombing. The Communist threat cannot be handled successfully by the United States setting itself up as a one-man policeman in an action to police the world against communism."

What rot, what absurdity, to think that this point of view would come to be given serious thought by the Government of the United States. It is beyond my power of comprehension.

To talk about the United States containing communism is the way to make Communists. Unilateral American military action in Asia is bound to create strength for communism.

But line up 85, 90, or 95 nations under the procedures of existing international law to keep the peace rather than to make war, and we will see a turn of events in human history that will once again return us to the road of peace and have us come back from the shocking road of war that we are now traveling.

We want to get used to this activity, I say to my associates in the Senate who have been criticizing the administration for its warmaking in Asia. We want to get used to the kind of language that will be used by our detractors and will be used, apparently, by those who do not know us; for if they think their actions will drive us underground, they could not be more wrong. We read such tommyrot as this:

Modern-day appeasers and isolationists are making our task difficult. Every day they make speeches and engage in some sort of irresponsible student rally.

The Communists are led to believe that we will surrender all of Asia to them without a nuclear showdown if they will just keep up the pressure.

So long as our enemies suspect that this may be the case, they are going to pay an increasingly greater price to test our will.

Therefore I have no doubt that our losses in Vietnam will increase so long as anyone suspects that the handful of Senators and Congressmen and the bearded beatniks—

I have only a mustache—
with the peace-at-any-price placards represent anything more than a small, poorly regarded fragment of American thinking.

That is the kind of smear tactic we can expect, I say to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. He has already received some. What the administration is worried about, in part—and I think I engage in an understatement when I say it—is that at least 80 percent of the academic world in this country are against the administration's policies in Vietnam, for the authorities, scholars, and students on Asia know that the Johnson administration is leading the country into a massive war that will kill hundreds of thousands of persons.

Do not forget that even ignorant, illiterate orientals are also children of God. I sat and listened to a briefing by a high spokesman of the government who took pride in the fact that now, at long last, we have a ratio of killing that is about 4 to 1 ratio in our favor. What has happened to our spiritual values? What has happened to our professing about believing in God? If we do not watch out, the propagandists will soon be telling the people of the country that God is on our side, for usually when we get into this kind of war hysteria, it is interesting to note how quickly the advocates of killing associate God with their cause. That does not have any relationship to and is not a part of my religious faith. I merely say that, in my judgment, my country is following an immoral, godless policy in Vietnam, for this war, in my judgment, cannot be reconciled with spiritual values.

I shall continue to pray to my God for peace; not for war.

Mr. President, let me say to the Johnson administration that the war now is not only McNamara's war and Rusk's war; it is Johnson's war, as well. This administration has a solemn moral responsibility to stop the killing.

I say to the clergy of America: Let us hear from you. I want to hear the church bells of America ring, not toll. The church bells of America are going to toll and toll and toll as the coffins start coming back from Asia if the Johnson administration's war in Asia is not stopped.

I say to our allies: I want to hear from you. I want to hear our allies say, at long last, that they will have the courage to call the United States and the Communists to an accounting under the procedures of international law.

The attack by Rusk and the attacks by other spokesmen of the administration upon the academic fraternity of this country, at least 80 percent of whom repudiate the Johnson war in Asia, must be met.

I announce to the Secretary of State, "Mr. Secretary, I shall meet you anywhere, before as many university campus faculty meetings as you want to arrange.

I shall discuss with you the McNamara-Rusk war in Asia."

I say to the academic world, "Meet them, for you have a great service to perform by bringing your authoritative knowledge to bear upon the great issue that the United States has now raised in threatening the peace and the future of mankind."

Says McNamara this morning, and I paraphrase him, "He does not think that Russia and Red China will come in the war." I say that he has been so irresponsibly wrong for so long that any prediction that McNamara makes about the future course of this war in Asia, in my judgment, should be discounted and completely discredited. He ought to have been removed as Secretary of Defense months ago, and the Secretary of State along with him.

We are confronted now with what I think is probably one of the most vital issues that has faced this Republic in all of its history. It is a vital issue that is very important to the security and future of this Republic. The many who are meeting on the campuses of America, seeking to exercise their precious right to petition this Government in opposition to a policy, have, in my judgment, every reason to have fear as far as the future of this Republic is concerned. I say to those academic leaders, "So many of you have asked me for so many months past, 'What can we do? We feel helpless.'" I say, "You can now rise up in campus after campus, in city after city, in community after community, and tell the country your answers to the propaganda of this administration's seeking to lull the population of this Nation into the false assumption that we are justified in increasing the rate of this war."

McNamara said this morning that he did not think that Russia and China would come into the war. My rhetorical question to that statement is: "Mr. Secretary, suppose they do?" I happen to think that our course of action and the plans for escalating this war that Rusk, McNamara, and Taylor intend to implement leave China and Russia no other course than to come into this war.

When they escalate those plans and those nuclear installations of China are destroyed—and the preventive war crowd in the Pentagon Building, in my judgment, are bent on destroy them—the massive war in Asia is on. World War III will then be over the brink, into which war we will tumble hundreds of thousands of American boys. It must be stopped. The only place to stop it is here in the United States, by the American people making it perfectly clear to the Johnson administration that they want a change from warmaking in Asia to the United States joining with other nations in peace keeping in Asia.

What makes anyone think that Red China, North Vietnam, and the Vietcong are going to come to any conference table called by the United States, no matter how nice sounding the semantics of unconditional discussion? Of course, we ought to have unconditional discussion. I applaud the President for his enunciation of the concept. It has to be implemented. It cannot be implemented

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8161

by the United States. It must be implemented by others.

That is why our country ought to do now what it should have done 2 years ago. In fact, we never should have violated the Geneva accords as we have been violating them from the very beginning. We should have insisted that this whole matter be laid before the nations of the world for a peaceful solution.

Mr. President, it is with great sadness in my heart that I speak out strenuously against my Government. But this is not the last time, may I tell you, Mr. President, Mr. Rusk, and Mr. McNamara. I say, "If you continue with this kind of propaganda, starting with the Rusk unfortunate speech of Saturday night, the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska, will not be alone. An increasing number of people across this country must speak out and will."

Let me say to these academic leaders and authorities in regard to Asia—who, in my judgment, were so unjustifiably attacked by innuendo, implication, and direct language by the Secretary of State last Saturday night, and by some of the spokesmen of this administration this morning—that those attacks will and must be answered.

Therefore, I do not welcome this controversy. But I am ready to meet the challenge. I am ready to meet the Secretary of State across the land before the very people he criticized last Saturday night, and let the facts be the judge. Let the facts speak for themselves.

What this means, of course, Mr. Secretary of State and Mr. Secretary of Defense, is that we will start telling all the facts to the American people, for the concealment from the American people of many things that are going on in southeast Asia and their rewriting of history after the fact are a betrayal of the trust of the office of Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, and also a betrayal of the American people themselves.

Let the Defense Establishment and the State Department tell the American people the facts about the innumerable times that the Geneva Treaty on war prisoners has been violated not only by the Vietcong, but by the South Vietnamese, with their U.S. advisers standing by doing nothing while these atrocities go on.

I never expected to live long enough to read the accurate accounts of the atrocities committed against the Vietcong—of course, the atrocities have gone the other way, too, those of the Vietcong against the South Vietnamese—such as the United Press dispatch last Friday reported. How those stories ever got out of Vietnam is a matter of wonder, because, let the American people know, the Pentagon and the State Department are seeking to screen the information that is coming out of Vietnam. Some of our correspondents who have written have even been arrested by the American military in order to prevent them from having access to events so they can tell the American people about them.

Mr. President, what do you suppose Ernie Pyle would say if he could come back to earth? What do you suppose

other fearless war correspondents would say? We have just as fearless and courageous war correspondents in Vietnam today. Many of them have been muzzled. They are not being allowed to tell the truth about the Johnson-Rusk-McNamara war.

The United Press dispatch told of a Vietcong prisoner with cloth wrapped around his neck, being subjected to a tug of war ordered on each end of that cloth while American military men stood by in silence. God forbid. God forbid. I know war is dirty. I know that when people become hysterical in combat, inhumanity to man is practiced. But the reports of these atrocities are too frequent to be alibied on the ground of temporary hysteria.

The sad fact is that the United States has not been doing its duty and standing up for the enforcement of the Geneva Treaty in regard to the handling of war prisoners. That inaction is not justified by pointing at the terror and viciousness of the Vietcong.

Mr. President, I wanted to make this statement as a matter of personal privilege, for I do not have to be hit on the head with a bat to know who is referred to in the vicious propaganda of the administration. I am well aware of the unhappiness I have caused for the Johnson administration because I have been speaking on an average of two to four times a week in opposition to my country's outlawry in Vietnam. But I intend to continue to do so, here and elsewhere.

I invite the Secretary of State to join me at meetings he selects, to meet with the academic group which he insulted Saturday night in his speech, and discuss there our points of view. But, Mr. Secretary, when you meet me on the platform, do not try to hide behind executive privilege. When we meet on the platform, do not give me the old line that you cannot tell me something because it might affect our security. Every time we ask for information to which we are entitled, the officials hide behind executive privilege. To you, the people, I say, "Demand of the Johnson administration that you be given all the information about the war in Asia."

I have stated before, and I repeat now, as an ardent supporter of the administration in most matters—probably 95 percent—that nothing could pain me more than to so completely disagree with the President in his foreign policy in Asia. But, as I have told him, I completely disagree with him.

I am satisfied that if he continues to follow the ill advice of McNamara and Rusk, he will come out of office the most discredited President in the history of this Nation.

No President can lead this Nation into a massive war in Asia, with all the consequences that will flow for many decades to come, and not go down in American history as totally discredited. This war is totally unnecessary.

We can bring economic freedoms, with resulting political freedoms, to the masses of Asia without killing them by the millions first. Our present course of

action will kill Asians by the millions, and it will also kill Americans, by the hundreds of thousands.

Mr. President, several weeks ago I received a very interesting letter from Mr. and Mrs. Howard Kurtz, of Chappaqua, N.Y., outlining some of their ideas for the control of war. Mr. Kurtz is a management consultant and former Air Force lieutenant colonel. Mrs. Kurtz is an ordained minister of the United Church of Christ.

As Mr. and Mrs. Kurtz suggests, an administration that can make "war on poverty," might well give time and thought to making "war on war."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter I received from them, together with a press interview which appeared in the Reporter-Dispatch of White Plains, N.Y., on March 3, 1965.

There being no objection, the letter and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR CONTROL PLANNERS, INC.,
Chappaqua, N.Y., March 17, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Vietnam is proof of American strategic failure. We lose if the war escalates. We lose if we withdraw. We lose if we negotiate a truce, freeing the enemy to regather his force for yet another thrust.

We are fighting a war in a location chosen by the enemy, at a time chosen by the enemy, in terrain beneficial to the enemy, and fighting the kind of war which is to the advantage of the enemy. We play the enemy's game, in the enemy's ballpark, according to the enemy's rules, when and if the enemy wants to play.

Every attack we make turns more Asian people, and other people of the world against us. Every attack weakens the cohesion with allied people and nations. Every attack tends to reunite our Communist enemies. Every attack tends to tarnish our image of moral leadership before the world, to the advantage of the enemy. Our excuse, as always, is that the "Communists" have forced us to do these things. It is our confession of weakness for mankind to see, that the "Communists" have the power to force us to do the things we say we do not want to do * * * things which jeopardize our own national security.

Americans are being killed in Vietnam in a war being fought in a strategic vacuum.

The strategic problem: The people of all nations are endangered if Vietnam escalates into modern war. The people of all nations need protection, not threat of annihilation. The nation which assumes responsibility for world leadership will not be the nation brandishing the power to destroy all nations * * * nor will it be the nation which disarms and weakens leadership strength. The deepest instincts of self-preservation and national defense will move the people of all nations to follow the leadership of that great power which will dare develop and demonstrate war safety power to guarantee the national security and political independence of all nations.

The President and world leadership: The President can now issue directives to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and National Security Council to begin active planning, development, creation, and demonstration of global war safety control systems strong enough to protect Israel people from the Arabs * * * protect Arab people from the Israeli

*** protect European people from the Germans *** protect German people from the Russians *** protect Russian people from the Chinese *** protect the people of all nations against threats of war or domination from any foreign source *** strong enough to prevent production and proliferation of nuclear weapons, and other weapons, in all nations *** strong enough to control production of war materiel, within an entirely new world security organization, or a vastly revised and strengthened United Nations, not world government.

This will be the most difficult and complex problem man has ever mobilized to solve. It will require a generation of creativity in military-technological-legal-economic-public opinion-political-moral fields. There is no precedent in military or political science, for an all-nation defense system. But man now has all of the necessary components within reach, if the effort is made, in addition to maintaining national defense power.

The first international war safety year *** 1967? The President can project a future yearlong exhibition of man's emerging new power to inspect, detect, and forcefully prevent any preparations or actions of war, anywhere in the world between nations. International war safety games can be held on a world stage for mankind to witness. The President can invite all nations to participate, to assure themselves this is not a plan for the United States to dominate the world. No nation will be able to veto the war safety games. They will be held with whatever nations chose to cooperate, but all communications channels will be used to see that the people of all nations learn the facts of the developing future power to protect their nations, and all other nations from danger of war. There are thousands of "impossible" problems which can be solved, when if the great new initiative begins with strong congressional bipartisan support, and authorizations and budgets.

But who in the hierarchy of American power wants to remove the threat of war?

Profiting from national insecurity: For 4 years, highest military and civilian advisers have refused to bring this new strategic power opportunity to the attention of President Kennedy or President Johnson. There are no evil men involved. There are dangerous unconscious motivations. Each time Communist world power and threat leaps up to new magnitude, American public danger goes up; Americans defense industry capital gains and executive bonuses go up; non-profit military think-factory budgets go up; engineering university research grants go up; subsidies for scientists go up; military responsibilities and promotions go up; the personal prosperity of the hierarchy of national security policy goes up.

In view of this barrier of self-interest, who will tell the American people and the President that we have within reach the power of safety—the power to bring the threat of war under control throughout the world?

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD G. KURTZ.
HARRIET B. KURTZ.

[From the Reporter Dispatch, White Plains, N.Y., Mar. 3, 1965]

CHAPPAQUA: PROFILE FOR A WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON—TECHNOLOGY, THEOLOGY JOIN FOR PEACE

(By Daniel Harrison)

CHAPPAQUA.—A remarkable couple has combined technology and theology with the aim of creating an "all-nation" defense system which would end the arms race and reduce international tension.

Over coffee in their book-lined living room at 150 South Bedford Road the other day, Mr. and Mrs. Howard G. Kurtz discussed war

safety control, now nascent but hopefully "the next historic stage" in man's age-old quest for security.

Mr. Kurtz is a management consultant and a former Air Force lieutenant colonel. His wife, Harriet, was ordained a minister of the United Church of Christ at the First Congregational Church last November.

In essence, war safety control calls for a worldwide intelligence system manned by scientists to detect and evaluate rapid military buildups and the use of United Nations inspection teams to investigate potential danger areas.

It is not, according to Mr. Kurtz, the same as disarmament, but a "new kind of power" in many dimensions, "something new to break a generation-long crisis."

GLOBAL NETWORK

The system the couple envisions would create a global communications network feeding data into electronic computer centers' air traffic control centers, electronic auditing of highways and railways, television equipped satellites and sensory devices that would detect radioactivity and bacteria that might be used in warfare. The couple has produced a booklet and a film on their plan, and much of the material is quite technical and complex.

Once "war safety control" is established, Mr. and Mrs. Kurtz say, nations would begin to eliminate their most destructive weapons.

The system is an extraordinary blending of ethical and technical concerns. In addition to data on the laser and cybernetics, the booklet contains statements from, among others, religious leaders endorsing the concept. Prominent persons in various other fields such as Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and Elmo Roper have reacted favorably.

On the theological side, Reverend Kurtz believes too many clergymen have been silent on issues of war and peace because they have been caught between their desire for peace and their patriotic instincts. She believes that war safety control results in a convergence of interests in national security and in an ordered world.

SOLID ALTERNATIVE

Mr. Kurtz believes the system presents a solid alternative to the arms race and simple disarmament, both of which he believes to be "dangerous." He regards national and regional defense systems as demonstrably meaningless, just as the castle became a meaningless defense against artillery. Thus, in his mind, the only alternative to a conflagration is the all-nation security system.

The United States, the plan says, must take the lead. In order for this to take place, the couple believes, public opinion must be aroused in favor of war safety control, and this is the major aim of their initial efforts. The booklet and other literature have been widely distributed, although the organization which the couple has started, War Control Planners, Inc., has no general membership, no dues, no regular meetings, no set program.

"I guess hope keeps us going," Reverend Kurtz said, when asked how a couple can hope to combat what President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex. Actually, Mr. and Mrs. Kurtz contend, the military would have certain functions under the plan, and skills now being employed toward the manufacture of arms would be used in the detection and control of arms.

INSPECTION DIFFERENCE

Mr. Kurtz notes that the difference between various inspection proposals made during the last decade and his plan is that no agreement from another nation is needed for war safety control to operate.

Reverend Kurtz, saying, "we refuse to believe this (the present world situation) is the way it will stay," notes that their plan

will not change basic human instincts toward such things as power and covetousness but will remove the inordinate dimensions these instincts have assumed in the modern world. National enmities and hostilities will be curbed, but the couple is quick to point out that national security won't be vitiated under the all-nation security plan. A diminution of "escalation" is the simple aim.

Among other factors needed to make the system work, the Kurtz' booklet notes, are a reevaluation and revamping of international law and the alleviation of economic woes that spur international friction. Specialists in the legal and economic fields, as well as in public opinion, will be needed for the systems implementation.

The couple observes, however, that "true security can be achieved only when this information (that obtained by technical means) is known and believed by all." They note that the detection of Russian missiles in Cuba in 1962 is an example of the type of activity war safety control would engage in, only the next time, as they put it, the fate of over 100 nations would not be dependent on the actions of the leaders of 2.

The report, at great length, thus suggests that modern technology now makes it possible to assure the prevention of war. But technology is not advocated to the exclusion of more spiritual concerns. Reverend Kurtz, in a sermon recently at the First Congregational Church entitled "Our Enemies and Our Religion," said: "If there are new dimensions to technical capabilities, there are as a corollary new dimensions of religious capabilities."

Mr. and Mrs. Kurtz, in their attempts to marshal public support for war safety control, have recently written letters to Vice President HUMPHREY and McGeorge BUNDBY, a top White House aid, in addition to the chairmen of key congressional committees. They have been assured by a deputy assistant secretary of defense that the Pentagon has not restrained officers who wish to study the plan.

The couple (they have a son and daughter in college), while readily noting that a generation of problem solving may be required to pioneer war control power, is sincerely earnest. Mr. Kurtz has said:

"If the American people are first to demonstrate not only a national defense capability second to none, and not only a group national defense capability such as NATO, but the new magnitude all nation defense capability of war safety control, aggressively to guard all nations against threats of future war, the impact on the public of the world will be so great that no one will remember who was the first to land a lonely astronaut on an empty moon."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have certain other communications and editorials printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the communications and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

APRIL 20, 1965.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

SIR: In view of the critical situation in Vietnam which now threatens peace in Asia and the security of Japan, we, the undersigned, have addressed an appeal to the Japanese Government, calling for its prompt and effective action toward peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese problem.

Enclosed, we are sending you a copy of the appeal, in the hope that it will draw your attention and prove to be of interest to you. We should be grateful if you would, in giving advice to the Chief Executive of the United

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8163

States, take into your consideration our opinion stated therein.

Sincerely yours,

HYOE OUCHI,

561 Gokurakuji, Kamakura, Kanagawa-ken, Japan, Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Former President of Hosei University, Member of the Japan Academy.

TOSHIYOSHI MIYAZAWA,

Professor of St. Paul's University, Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Member of the Japan Academy.

JIRO OSARAGI,

Writer, Member of the Art Academy of Japan.

TETSUZO TANIKAWA,

President of Hosei University.

SAKAE WAGATSUMA,

Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Member of the Japan Academy.

APPEAL TO THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The devastation and the danger brought about by the war in Vietnam are being aggravated day by day. Not only is this war causing unsurpassable misery to the people of Vietnam, but it is also constituting a great menace to peace in Asia and to the security of Japan. It is no wonder that there is rapidly growing among the Japanese people concern and apprehension as to the implications of the war. We deeply regret that the Japanese Government has not taken any position action by way of fulfilling its responsibilities to guarantee the security of Japan and to restore peace in Asia.

Therefore, we strongly urge our Government to make a prompt decision according to the three proposals we present below, and to declare its intention to the Japanese people and to other nations.

1. If the United States should persist in her present policy, there is an imminent danger of armed conflicts ensuing between the United States and the People's Republic of China, regardless of the calculated design of the Government of the United States. Furthermore, there is a natural fear for the tension being heightened at the 38th parallel in Korea, between South Korea, who has sent troops to South Vietnam, on the one hand, and North Korea, who has pledged military support to the National Liberation Front (Vietcong), on the other. It is past any dispute that our involvement in these armed conflicts resulting from the military operations of the United States will be absolutely incompatible with the security of Japan.

It is true that Japan is bound by the security treaty to collaborate with the United States. Nevertheless, article I of this treaty holds that, in accordance with the provision of the United Nations Charter, international disputes shall be settled by peaceful means, and the parties to the treaty shall refrain from "the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state." We believe that the present use of force by the United States in Vietnam is in violation of these provisions. It is evidently in line with the general rule of international law that in such a case Japan is not necessarily bound by the above mentioned duty of collaboration. This point is clearly illustrated by the position of the United States who, at the time of the Suez crisis, opposed the military actions undertaken by Britain and France, in spite of the fact that the United States was in alliance with these two nations.

Accordingly, we appeal to the Japanese Government to manifest its position immediately to its own people and to other nations that if the war in Vietnam should escalate into a war on a larger scale involving additional countries, Japan would refuse

to let the U.S. bases in Japan be used for the purpose of military combat operations. A declaration of the Japanese Government in making this stand will in itself be an important impetus toward preventing the war in Vietnam from escalating into armed conflicts between the United States and China or the Soviet Union.

2. The direct cause of such expansion of the war in Vietnam is the air attacks by the United States on North Vietnam. For this reason, the first thing that should take place to prevent this danger is the cessation of the bombardment on North Vietnam by the United States and South Vietnamese forces.

Moreover, the air attacks on the north are in themselves operations beyond the limits of self-defense, even if further escalation of the war might somehow be avoided. Such an abuse of the right of self-defense is contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and article I of the Japan-United States security treaty. It may be noted that the Government of the United States no longer endeavors to justify its actions by invoking such concepts as "retaliation" or "collective self-defense," as it did at the beginning of the air attacks on the north.

Though there may be a certain degree of aid given by North Vietnam to the National Liberation Front, even the figures given by the U.S. Government in the white paper on Vietnam, show clearly that the military assistance from the north is very modest in terms of military force. Looking back on the whole process of the war in Vietnam, we are persuaded to believe that the aid from the north has been more of a counterbalance to the enormous amount of military aid offered by the United States to the South Vietnamese Government, which has taken measures to suppress any groups opposing its policies, and has forfeited the support of the people. This means that the United States is not entitled to justify the air attacks on the north, by citing the help extended by North Vietnam to the National Liberation Front.

For these two reasons, we urge the Japanese Government to appeal to the United States for immediate suspension of the air attacks on the north.

3. At present, in South Vietnam, a gruesome war is going on, side by side with the air attacks on the north. We cannot refrain from expressing our profound indignation against the recent use by the U.S. forces of napalm bombs, poisonous gases and other atrocious weapons, and especially against the bringing in of tactical nuclear weapons into South Vietnam.

If the United States should continue to fight the National Liberation Front with such means of warfare, which would make the war in Vietnam literally a war of annihilation, the greater part of South Vietnam will inevitably be reduced to a scorched land of complete devastation. The people of South Vietnam are exhausted by the war that has lasted more than 20 years. There is no doubt about their not desiring continuation of such a war. The United States, however, is pursuing war efforts and destruction, against the will of the Vietnamese people who are longing for peace. The fact that Japan belongs to Asia makes it all the more impossible for us to remain inactive in the face of the suffering of the people in South Vietnam.

In view of what has been stated above, the war in South Vietnam conducted by the United States cannot escape from being called an inexcusable disregard of human dignity and the right of national self-determination. In order that South Vietnam should emerge out of its present condition of misery and despair, diplomatic negotiations should be opened without delay to terminate the war. In this respect, we welcome President Johnson's statement, made in response to the proposal by the 17 nonaligned nations, to the effect that the United States "remains

ready for unconditional discussions." This kind of diplomatic discussion, however, must be accompanied by an unconditional ceasefire, so that there can be no room for continued military operations with the aim of gaining a favorable position for negotiation.

The essential conditions for a solution to the war in Vietnam will be firstly to base the whole argument on the recognition that this war is fundamentally a civil war, and should be treated as such; the National Liberation Front should be recognized as a party to the negotiation; the U.S. troops should eventually be withdrawn; and there should be corresponding suspension of the aid from North Vietnam.

We fervently hope that the Japanese Government, in full realization of the points cited above, will send urgent appeals to the United States and other nations concerned to open diplomatic negotiations at once, to which the National Liberation Front should be a party, and to effect an immediate ceasefire, so that there will be the earliest possible restoration of peace in Vietnam.

APRIL 20, 1965.

TOSHIYOSHI MIYAZAWA,

Professor of Law, St. Paul's University, Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Member of the Japan Academy.

JIRO OSARAGI,

Writer, Member of the Art Academy of Japan.

HYOE OUCHI,

Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Former President of Hosei University, Member of the Japan Academy.

TETSUZO TANIKAWA,

President of Hosei University.

SAKAE WAGATSUMA,

Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Member of the Japan Academy.

LIST OF SIGNATURES

Abe, Tomoji, writer; professor of English literature, Meiji University.

Aomi, Junichi, professor of jurisprudence, University of Tokyo.

Arizumi, Toru, professor of law, University of Tokyo.

Arisawa, Hiromi, professor emeritus of the University of Tokyo.

Banno, Masataka, professor of Chinese history, Tokyo Metropolitan University.

Egami, Fujio, professor of biochemistry, University of Tokyo.

Egami, Namio, professor of archeology, University of Tokyo.

Fujimoto, Yoichi, professor of physics, Waseda University.

Fukuda, Kanichi, professor of political science, University of Tokyo.

Fukushima, Masao, professor of Chinese law, University of Tokyo.

Fukutake, Tadashi, professor of sociology, University of Tokyo.

Hidaka, Rokuro, professor of sociology, University of Tokyo.

Hori, Toyohiko, professor of political science, Waseda University.

Horigome, Yozo, professor of European history, University of Tokyo.

Hotta, Yoshie, writer.

Ienaga, Saburo, professor of Japanese history, Tokyo University of Education.

Iizuka, Koji, professor of human geography, University of Tokyo.

Inoue, Yoshio, professor of Tokyo Union Theological Seminary.

Ishii, Teruhisa, professor of law, University of Tokyo.

Ishikawa, Shigeru, professor of economics, Hitotsubashi University.

Isono, Fujiko, lecturer in sociology, Japan Women's University.

Isono, Seichi, professor of law, Tokyo University of Education.

Ito, Masami, professor of law, University of Tokyo.

Ito, Mitsuharu, associate professor of economics, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Ito, Sei, writer.
 Iyanaga, Shokichi, professor of mathematics, University of Tokyo.
 Jodal, Tano, former president of Japan Women's University.
 Kalkō, Takeshi, writer.
 Kainō, Michitaka, lawyer.
 Kato, Shuichi, writer.
 Katsuta, Shuichi, professor of pedagogy, University of Tokyo.
 Kawata, Tadashi, associate professor of international economics, University of Tokyo.
 Kido, Mataichi, professor of journalism, Doshisha University.
 Kikuchi, Isao, former president of Kyushu University.
 Kinoshita, Hanji, professor of political history, Tokyo University of Education.
 Kiyōmiya, Shiro, professor of law, Nihon University.
 Kuno, Osamu, lecturer in philosophy, Gakushuin University.
 Kobayashi, Naoki, professor of law, University of Tokyo.
 Maruyama, Masao, professor of political science, University of Tokyo.
 Matsuda, Tomoo, professor of economic history, University of Tokyo.
 Matsumoto, Nobuhiro, professor of oriental history, Kelo University.
 Minemura, Teruo, professor of labor law, Kelo University.
 Miyake, Yasuo, professor of chemistry, Tokyo University of Education.
 Miyazaki, Yoshikazu, professor of economics, Yokohama National University.
 Munakata, Selya, professor of pedagogy, University of Tokyo.
 Mutal, Ritsaku, professor emeritus of Tokyo University of Education.
 Nagai, Michio, professor of sociology, Tokyo Institute of Technology.
 Nakagawa, Zennosuke, professor of law, Gakushuin University.
 Nakamura, Akira, professor of political science, Hosei University.
 Nakamura, Takafusa, associate professor of statistics, University of Tokyo.
 Nakano, Yoshio, professor of English literature, Chuo University.
 Nambara, Shigeru, former president of the University of Tokyo.
 Nilda, Noboru, professor emeritus of the University of Tokyo.
 Noda, Yoshiyuki, professor of law, University of Tokyo.
 Nogami, Mokichiro, professor of physics, University of Tokyo.
 Nogami, Yaeko, authoress.
 Nomura, Heiji, professor of labor law, Waseda University.
 Nomuro, Kōichi, associate professor of Chinese history, St. Paul's University.
 Oe, Kenzaburo, writer.
 Okōchi, Kazuo, president of the University of Tokyo.
 Ooka, Shohel, writer.
 Otsuka, Hisao, professor of economic history, University of Tokyo.
 Saitō, Makoto, professor of American history, University of Tokyo.
 Sakamoto, Yoshikazu, professor of international politics, University of Tokyo.
 Satō, Isao, professor of constitutional law, Seikei University.
 Sugli, Toshio, professor of French literature, St. Paul's University.
 Sumiya, Mikio, professor of economics, University of Tokyo.
 Serizawa, Kōjirō, writer.
 Tajima, Eiizō, professor of physics, St. Paul's University.
 Takahashi, Kōhachirō, professor of economic history, University of Tokyo.
 Takano, Yūichi, professor of international law, University of Tokyo.
 Takeda, Kiyoko, professor of history of thought, International Christian University.
 Takeuchi, Yoshimi, writer, Chinese literature.

Tamanol, Yoshirō, professor of economics, University of Tokyo.
 Tanaka, Shinjiro, critics, arms control and disarmament.
 Tsuru, Shigeto, professor of economics, Hitotsubashi University.
 Tezuka, Tomio, professor of German literature, St. Paul's University.
 Tomonaga, Sin-Itiro, professor of physics, Tokyo University of Education.
 Toyoda, Toshiyuki, professor of physics, St. Paul's University.
 Uchiyama, Shōzō, professor of civil law, Hosei University.
 Uemura, Tamaki, honorary president of Japan YWCA.
 Wakimura, Yoshitarō, professor emeritus of the University of Tokyo.
 Watanabe, Kazuo, professor of French literature, St. Paul's University.
 Yamamoto, Tatsuo, professor of southeast Asian history, University of Tokyo.
 Yoshida, Hidekazu, music critic.
 Yoshida, Tomizō, director, Cancer Institute, Tokyo.
 Hirotsu, Kazuo, writer.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
 Bronx, N.Y., April 23, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The ad hoc faculty committee on Vietnam and the ad hoc student committee on Vietnam wish to express our agreement with your public call for a temporary cessation in the air raids over Vietnam. At the same time we would like to apprise you of what we have done to stimulate a thoughtful revision of American policy on Vietnam. On Wednesday evening, April 14, a teach-in on American policy in Vietnam was held on the University Heights campus of New York University.

The response of the college community to the teach-in has demonstrated that concern over the present course of our involvement in southeast Asia is uppermost in the minds of many Americans. An auditorium of 400 seats was filled to capacity, with standees from 8 p.m. to 1:30 a.m. To handle the overflow, the speeches were sent over the public address system to an adjacent cafeteria. At 4:30 a.m., the final lecture of the evening was heard by 250. Allowing for turnover, a safe estimate is that over 700 students and faculty were in attendance. This is reputed to be the largest audience ever to attend a discussion on public affairs at University College. The strong effect this meeting exerted on the audience has been shown by the debate on Vietnam which dominated the classroom and cafeteria for the remainder of the week.

The political, economic and military background of the Vietnamese war, together with an exposition of the administration policy in Vietnam were presented. While different aspects and views were presented, the consensus of the presentations at the teach-in can be summarized as follows: The United States must take immediate steps to reverse a policy in Vietnam that is both dangerous and futile. The speakers noted that President Johnson's address at Johns Hopkins does offer a possible hope of a move toward a Vietnamese settlement. However, they repeatedly stated that continuing elements of the U.S. policy preclude realization of that hope and that the modified policy is still both dangerous and futile.

The willingness to negotiate unconditionally will not bear fruit until a minimal situation is created for North Vietnam's participation in negotiations: a cessation of air attacks on North Vietnam and the inclusion of the Vietminh in all negotiations. Whether North Vietnam or the Vietminh will come to the bargaining table under these conditions is problematical; that they will not come without them has been borne out by state-

ments subsequent to the President's speech. No offer of a major development program for southeast Asia, however inviting, can get negotiations underway until these conditions are met. Men will sit down and reason together only when honor and politics permit.

Respectfully yours,

CONSTANCE R. SUTTON,
 PHILIP G. ZIMBARDO,
 Cochairmen, Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Vietnam.

OPEN LETTER TO THE FACULTY OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

We find ourselves now in a time of great social unrest and political turmoil—a time when we are shocked by the lack of concern and involvement shown by man for his fellow man. It is one thing to be unable to relate oneself to abstractions like "society" or "country," but quite another to disengage oneself from other human beings.

To counter this state of alienation or non-involvement, perhaps the most serious problem of our generation, a new force has arisen—college students have been in the vanguard of protest movements throughout the country. Their effect within the civil rights movement has been considerable.

It is time for college faculties not only to join their students, but to provide, by example, the leadership in a national protest against our Government's actions in Vietnam.

We believe that the national administration has adopted a military policy which could involve generations of our students in a war on the mainland of Asia.

To preserve peace in Vietnam and to "show the Communists we mean business," we have changed our position from one of providing "advisers" and equipment to the ever-changing South Vietnam governments, to one of direct belligerence. Our Government has explained that its efforts are directed at stopping military aggression. Yet ironically, we support a regime that bombs schoolhouses and ignores the protest of Vietnamese mothers carrying the corpses of their children.

The reasons given to the American people why we must kill as the quickest way to achieve peace would hardly stand examination in a college classroom. We are struck by the Orwellian duplicity used in policy statements: war is peace and destruction means survival.

The pressure of public and world opinion has finally broken the President's silence. He has agreed to consider negotiations, but not to stop the war in order to do it. As President Johnson said, the instruments of war are evidence not of power but of folly. Let us ask, then, that the path to reason not be cluttered by the debris of folly. War is not only foolish: it is immoral.

While we welcome even these ambiguous overtures to peace, we maintain that America must stop all military action immediately in order to conduct negotiations in good faith. Moreover, we must not dictate peace terms, but allow the United Nations to negotiate any settlement.

We, the undersigned, therefore urge a mobilization of faculty in a venture to protest the war in Vietnam, to call for immediate cessation of all bombing, and encourage negotiations which will lead to peace.

PLEASE ANNOUNCE THIS PART TO YOUR CLASSES

We therefore wish to support actively the march on Washington of April 17, 1965, of faculty and students from colleges throughout the Nation, by urging our colleagues and our students to join us on an NYU-sponsored bus to Washington.

A bus will be leaving from our Heights campus early Saturday morning, April 17, and returning here in the evening. The cost will be \$6 per seat round trip. Reservations should be made by you as soon as possible. They can be obtained in the lobby of Gould Student Center or at the Faculty Club during

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8165

lunch time. A number of faculty members have already made this commitment. We need you. Ideally we would like you to come along. If you can't come, would you be willing to contribute money for a student to go?

In addition to this protest to be made in our Nation's Capital, and in order to have the issues presented publicly, we are holding a "teach-in." This is a technique in which faculty members and other informed speakers present information, opinions, and their views about the military, political, social, and moral issues involved in Vietnam (not necessarily the views of the ad hoc committee). There will be an opportunity for questions and discussion. It will be held in the Playhouse, Gould Student Center, on Wednesday, April 14, starting at 8 p.m. We want you to lend your support to this venture. You can do this in several ways:

1. Attend, and convince others to attend.
2. Be willing to assist our committee with the many tasks involved (by contacting one of us immediately).

Philip G. Zimbardo, Chairman; Robert D. Burrowes, Edwin S. Campbell, James T. Crown, Joan Fiss, H. Mark Roelofs, H. Laurence Ross, Constance R. Sutton, Thomas W. Wahman, Ad Hoc Committee on Vietnam.

TEACH-IN ON THE ISSUES IN VIETNAM

(Wednesday night, April 14, 1965, New York University—University College Playhouse, Gould Student Center, West 181st Street and University Avenue, the Bronx, doors open 7:45 p.m.)

8: Philip G. Zimbardo (NYU), chairman, Prof. Seymour Melman, Columbia University, "A Strategy for Peace."

8:50: Dr. Vo Thanh Minh, "The South Vietnamese Position."

9:15: Prof. Amitai Etzioni, Columbia University, "Which Way Out?"

10:15: Constance R. Sutton (NYU), chairman, Prof. Robert Engler, Queens College, "The United States and the World in Revolution."

11: Prof. Ernest van den Haag, New York University, "Is Intervention for Freedom Justified?"

12: Joan Fiss (NYU), chairman, Raymond Brown, Sarah Lawrence College, "The Domestic Economic Implications of the Cold War."

12:45: Prof. Anthony J. Pearce, New York University, "How Did the United States Become Involved in Vietnam: 1954-60?"

1:45: Roscoe C. Brown, Jr. (NYU), chairman, Mr. Ross Flannagan, New York Friends Group, "The Moral and Human Dimensions of the War in Vietnam."

2:30: Michael Arons (NYU), chairman, Prof. James T. Crown, New York University, "The Great War or the Great Society?"

3:15: Prof. Stanley Millet, Briarcliff College, "American Policy in Vietnam."

Sponsors: Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Vietnam, New York University.

Cochairmen: Philip G. Zimbardo, Constance R. Sutton; Robert D. Burrowes, Edwin S. Campbell, James T. Crown, Joan Fiss, H. Mark Roelofs, H. Laurence Ross, and Thomas W. Wahman.

Ad Hoc Student Committee on Vietnam, New York University.

Cochairmen: B. Diamond; S. Barkas; P. Jacobson; S. Greenfield; G. Chieffetz; B. Mittenzweil; K. Schoen; D. Feder; J. Meyerson; J. Ween; K. Hirsch; E. Winterbottom; L. Dworkin; L. Giovannella; B. Glushakow; R. Forbes; N. Sachs; J. Roberts; A. Weinert; J. Arak; and A. Greenbaum.

STATEMENT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR A TEACH-IN ON VIETNAM

James Reston wrote, "The first casualty in every shooting war is commonsense, and the second is open and free discussion."

As teachers and citizens, we are deeply concerned both with the implications of our present military actions in Vietnam, and with the relative absence of information, debate, and public discussion of the reasons for our involvement there. Our teach-in of April 14, 1965, grows out of these concerns.

We seek to generate discussions based upon the best available information. We do this in the belief that this is one way in which the academic community can best carry out its responsibility toward providing students with an informed basis for their opinions and actions on major issues.

Many topics and views were presented in our teach-in. The speakers were selected on the basis of their area of special competence. A serious attempt was made to present as many informed positions as possible. The conclusions reached by the ad hoc committee do not necessarily represent the views of the speakers. Our major conclusions, therefore, are:

1. The U.S. Government has not offered adequate information and arguments in support of the military risks we are continuing to run in Vietnam.

2. Our present policies in Vietnam have led to the spreading of the war from the south to the north, and create a serious risk of involving the United States in a military conflict with China. We welcome the President's offer for unconditional negotiations, but our stepped-up military actions following the President's offer vitiate the possible positive effect of his gesture.

3. Therefore, we believe that the U.S. Government should cease bombing attacks immediately in the north and should attempt to arrange a cease-fire in the south. This should be followed by negotiations with whomever it may be necessary—not excluding the Vietcong—to the end of insuring peace throughout Vietnam.

4. We disagree that vital interests of the United States are involved in southeast Asia and particularly in Vietnam, and therefore we believe that the solution to the political, social, and economic problems of the peoples of this area should be determined by them with the assistance of the United Nations, and should not be directed by the United States.

5. Finally, we feel that the technique of a "teach-in" is an effective device for providing the academic community with a forum for the public exchange of information and opinions in an atmosphere appropriate to the serious consideration of current, complex issues of national significance.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
New Haven, Conn., April 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of a letter on Vietnam sent to the President last week and signed by 209 members of the Yale faculty.

My very best personal wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. DAHL.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn., March 29, 1965.
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We should be deeply gratified to learn that American policy in Vietnam is to negotiate a settlement. We support such a policy.

We believe that recent American actions in Vietnam are inconsistent with your great goal, which we share, of reducing international tensions and moving toward a more stable and more peaceful world. We realize that the conflict in Vietnam is not subject to a simple solution; we realize also that

you and your advisers may have important information of which we are unaware. But on the basis of the information available to us, including the recent white paper, we are strongly persuaded that our policies in Vietnam have been inappropriate.

First, no new elements seem to have been added to the steadily deteriorating political and military situation in Vietnam, except for our recent policy of escalation. After nearly a decade, American policy has failed to produce a stable and friendly regime that commands enough loyal support among the people of South Vietnam to turn the tide of war. The crisis cries out for a new definition of our true interests in Vietnam.

Second, the one new element, the policy of escalation by bombing North Vietnam, incurs great new risks without much promise of achieving its objectives, whatever these may be. The balance of advantage in what is to a great extent a civil war in jungles, mountains, and rice paddies cannot be altered very greatly, we believe, by bombing bases, military personnel, and civilians in North Vietnam; the evidence from World War II, we think, supports this judgment. If the objective is to frighten the leaders of North Vietnam or China into submission, experience from World War II suggests that the method is psychologically inept and that the opposite result from the one hoped for is equally likely. If the objective is to force the Soviet leadership to choose between cooperating with the United States or supporting Communist revolutionary movements in Asia, the United States is, we believe, taking a foolhardy gamble. If Soviet leaders are compelled by us to choose between a total break with Communist China and a total break with the United States, the Soviets may well choose to break with the United States. In any case, our policies make it more difficult to strengthen Russian moderation against Chinese intransigence. Yet, a satisfactory settlement hinges more on the attitudes of leaders in Communist China and the Soviet Union than on North Vietnam. If, then, the objective of recent policy is to enable us to negotiate from strength at some future time, we see little prospect that the tide of war will turn in our favor in the foreseeable future. And if it does not? Must we, in order to "negotiate from strength," then escalate the war to higher and higher levels, run greater and greater risks, provide ever more dramatic provocations to the North Vietnamese to send their large army marching southward, to the Chinese to enter actively into the war, and to the Soviets to abandon their doctrine of peaceful co-existence?

Third, our actions in Vietnam are, we think, producing more enemies than friends of the United States in Asia. It is difficult for us to believe that the ordinary Vietnamese, whether in the South or in the North, see much difference between Americans and their predecessors, the French colonials and their army. We Americans know that our actions are not intended to implement "white imperialism in Asia"; but our policies and actions have a different and much more sinister look to Asians. As to the famous "falling dominoes" argument so commonly used to justify our actions, this is almost exclusively an American doctrine; it does not have much support among the "dominoes" themselves. Indeed, these "dominoes" have a thousand years experience in resisting Chinese imperialism. Our two greatest Asian allies, Japan and India, do not endorse our actions in Vietnam, and so far as we can judge, we lack the support of leaders and the general public in those countries. Prime Minister Shastri has appealed for negotiations, as have Secretary General U Thant, Prince Sihanouk, and two European leaders who could hardly be regarded as naive or sympathetic to Communist expansion, Pope Paul and General de Gaulle.

Fourth, we are deeply concerned with the legal and moral implications of our actions in Vietnam. Our military intervention appears to us, as it evidently does to much of the rest of the world, to constitute a violation of the 1954 Geneva agreements. As to our moral position, we cannot help wondering, Mr. President, whether your advisers have given adequate weight in their calculations to the men, women, and children, whose lives are irreparably harmed or destroyed by our bombings. Have we grown callous to the concrete human meaning of "escalation"?

Finally, Mr. President, we believe that American opinion itself is too divided to sustain a long crisis in Vietnam, much less an enlargement of our participation in that war. Among the people we know best, the community of scholars and teachers, there is extensive opposition to escalation. Indeed, a great many thoughtful people throughout the country, the editors of the New York Times, other journalists, publicists of national repute and unimpeachable integrity, like Walter Lippmann, share our view. We believe, therefore, that our policies in Vietnam run the additional risk of creating such discontent, frustration, and disunity here at home as to impair the achievement of other goals and our effectiveness in dealing with the problem of Vietnam itself.

We therefore urge you, Mr. President, to mobilize the energies of your administration in seeking a new and different solution to the problem of Vietnam. In particular, we urge you to enter into negotiations with the leaders of countries whose agreement is needed in order to bring about a cease-fire, to neutralize the area, and to eliminate the direct military participation of the United States.

We should not presume to specify the precise nature of the negotiations, whether you should use the good offices of General de Gaulle or the auspices of the United Nations, or with what specific leaders or countries you should seek negotiations.

We do strongly urge, however, that the United States vigorously and sincerely seek to arrive at a solution by negotiation, not by escalation. We urge you not to lay down requirements for entering into negotiations that the North Vietnamese or others obviously are not going to meet. Though we may continue to hope for it, we cannot reasonably demand or expect that a cease-fire and a cessation of all activity will precede negotiations: these are among the objectives to be achieved by the negotiations themselves.

If the American Government pursues a policy of negotiation as energetically as it has, until now, pursued its policy of unilateral action, we are most unlikely to be worse off than we are now. Surely we shall be better off than we are going to be as time goes on and our position deteriorates as our military intervention escalates. And there is some reasonable hope that we shall move toward a goal that after 10 years of unilateral action still eludes us, a tenable solution to the conflict in Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN BLUM,
Professor of History.
KARL DEUTSCH,
Professor of Political Science.
ROBERT TRIFFIN,
Professor of Economics.
ROBERT A. DAHL,
Professor of Political Science.
GEORGE D. MOSTOW,
Professor of Mathematics.
MARY WRIGHT,
Professor of History.

P.S.—The following members of the faculty of Yale University have subscribed to this statement:

Department of anthropology; J. Buettner-Janusch, associate professor; Harold C.

Conklin, professor; Richard N. Henderson, instructor; Sidney W. Mintz, professor; June Nash, assistant professor; Harold W. Schefler, assistant professor.

Department of architecture: Serge Chermayeff, professor; Peter Millard, assistant professor.

Department of biochemistry: George Brawerman, assistant professor; Michael Caplow, associate professor; William Konigsberg, associate professor; S. Vinogradov, research associate.

Department of biology: R. J. Andrew, assistant professor; N. Philip Ashmole, assistant professor; E. J. Boell, professor; Joseph Gail, professor; Arthur W. Gaiston, professor; Ken Hartford, laboratory business manager; Christopher K. Mathews, assistant professor; R. Bruce Nicklas, associate professor; Donald F. Poulson, professor; Thomas L. Poulson, assistant professor; Charles L. Remington, associate professor; J. P. Trinkhaus, professor.

Department of chemistry: William Doering, professor; Julian M. Sturtevant, professor.

Department of classics: Eric A. Havelock, professor; Gilbert Lawall, instructor; Adam Parry, associate professor; Peter W. Rose, lecturer; Joseph A. Russo, instructor; Erich Segal, visiting lecturer.

Divinity school: Rev. J. Edward Dirks, professor; Rev. Robert C. Johnson, dean; Rev. K. S. Latourette, professor emeritus; David Little, assistant professor; Rev. B. D. Napier, professor.

Department of economics: Bela Balassa, associate professor; Ronald G. Bodkin, assistant professor; William C. Brainard, assistant professor; Gerald K. Helleiner, assistant professor; Shane J. Hunt, assistant professor; Tjalling C. Koopmans, professor; Donald C. Mead, assistant professor; James L. Pierce, assistant professor; Lloyd G. Reynolds, professor; Mary T. Reynolds, research associate; Peter Schran, assistant professor.

Department of engineering and applied science: J. L. Hirschfield, assistant professor; Franz B. Tuteur, associate professor.

Department of English: E. Talbot Donaldson, professor.

Department of epidemiology and public health: Richard A. Greenberg, assistant professor; Kathleen H. Howe, assistant professor; Irving Miller, instructor; Anita Pepper, research associate; M. Elizabeth Tennant, associate professor emeritus; Joan H. Vicinus, research assistant.

Institute of Far Eastern Languages: Kenneth D. Butler, assistant professor of Japanese; Charles J. Chu, instructor in Chinese; Hugh M. Stimson, assistant professor of Chinese.

School of Forestry: William E. Reifsnnyder, associate professor.

Department of Geography: David E. Snyder, assistant professor.

Department of Geology: John H. Ostrom, assistant professor; John Rodgers, professor; A. L. Washburn, professor.

Department of History: Robert Anchor, instructor; Harry J. Benda, associate professor; Hans W. Gaizke, professor; Eugene Levy, acting instructor; Robert S. Lopez, professor; Edmund S. Morgan, professor; Norman Pollack, assistant professor; Harry R. Rudin, professor; Robin W. Winks, associate professor; C. Vann Woodward, professor; Arthur F. Wright, professor.

Department of the History of Art: Kermit S. Champa, instructor; Kurt W. Forster, assistant professor; George Heard Hamilton, professor; Robert L. Herbert, associate professor; S. K. Kostof, assistant professor; Jules D. Prown, assistant professor; Vincent Scully, professor.

Department of Industrial Administration: Roger Harrison, assistant professor; Fred I. Steele, lecturer.

Law school: Layman E. Allen, associate professor; Joseph W. Bishop, Jr., professor;

Boris I. Bittker, professor; Ralph S. Brown, Jr., professor; Marshall Cohen, senior fellow; Thomas I. Emerson, professor; Grant Gilmore, professor; Joseph Goldstein, professor; Pauli Murray, senior fellow; Louis H. Pollak, professor; Charles A. Reich, professor; Clyde W. Summers, professor; Harry H. Wellington, professor.

Department of linguistics: Sydney M. Lamb, associate professor; Rulon Wells, professor.

Department of mathematics: Joseph Auslander, research associate; Richard Beals, instructor; Frank Hahn, assistant professor; G. A. Hedlund, professor; R. Larsen, instructor; William S. Massey, professor; J. Peter May, instructor; Stephen Puckette, research fellow; Charles E. Rickart, professor; George B. Seligman, associate professor.

Medical school: Dr. Marie J. Browne, assistant professor of pediatrics; Harry Fehr, research associate in physiology; Dr. Thomas F. Ferris, instructor in medicine; Dr. Lawrence R. Freedman, associate professor of medicine; Daniel L. Kilne, associate professor of physiology; Dr. Paul H. Lavietes, associate clinical professor of medicine; Dr. N. Ronald Morris, assistant professor of pharmacology; Dr. Ellis A. Perls, clinical instructor, child study center; William H. Prusoff, associate professor of pharmacology; Juliana P. Rhymes, research associate in pediatrics and nursing; Dr. Norman S. Talner, associate professor of pediatrics; George Wolf, postdoctoral fellow in anatomy.

Department of molecular biology and biophysics: Alan Garen, professor; Irwin Rubenstein, assistant professor; Robert C. Wilhelm, assistant professor.

School of music: Richmond Browne, assistant professor; Robert Conant, assistant professor.

Department of near eastern languages and literatures: Marijan Despalatovic, assistant in instruction of Serbo-Croatian; Marvin H. Pope, professor of northwestern Semitic languages.

School of nursing: Jean Barrett, professor; Vera Keane, research associate.

Department of philosophy: Richard J. Bernstein, associate professor; Norman S. Care, instructor; Frederic B. Fitch, professor; James Millikan, acting instructor; George A. Schrader, professor.

Department of physics: Earl E. Ensberg, research associate; Henry Margenau, professor; William W. Watson, professor.

Department of physiology: Dr. Louis H. Nahum, lecturer emeritus.

Department of political science: Robert E. Lane, professor.

Department of psychiatry: Dr. Jules V. Coleman, clinical professor; Alice R. Cornelson, research associate; Yasuko Fliby, research fellow; Dr. Stephen Fleck, professor; Dr. Robert J. Lifton, associate professor; Roger K. McDonald, associate professor; Nea M. Morton, assistant professor; Dr. Albert J. Solnit, professor.

Department of psychology: Robert P. Abelson, professor; James B. Appel, assistant professor; Sidney J. Blatt, assistant professor; Claude E. Buxton, professor; Irvin L. Child, professor; Dorothy D. Ciarlo, research associate; Michael Cole, assistant professor; Edmund J. Fantino, assistant professor; D. H. Goldberg, lecturer; Michael Kahn, assistant professor; William Kessen, associate professor; Julius Laffal, associate clinical professor; Paul Schulze, clinical instructor; Alan P. Towbin, assistant clinical professor; Cynthia Wild, assistant professor.

Department of religious studies: Rev. Hans W. Frei, associate professor; Rev. James M. Gustafson, professor.

Department of romance languages: Victor H. Brombert, professor of French; Manuel Duran, professor of Spanish; Robert G. Mead, Jr., visiting lecturer in Spanish; Edgar Pauk, acting instructor in Italian; Henry Peyre, professor of French.

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8167

Department of Slavic languages and literatures: Richard F. Gustafson, assistant professor of Russian.

Department of sociology: Wendell Bell, professor; Robert M. Cook, assistant professor; Diana Crane, assistant professor; George A. Huaco, assistant professor; James A. Mau, assistant professor; Stephen W. Reed, associate professor.

Department of statistics: G. Yeo, research associate and lecturer.

Additions to the original list of subscribers: Divinity school: Rev. Charles W. Forman.

Drama school: Edward C. Cole, associate professor.

Department of English: Edward J. Gordon, associate professor.

Department of epidemiology and public health: Jean Emmons, associate in research.

Department of History: Prosser Gifford, assistant professor; J. H. Hexter, professor; Staughton Lynd, assistant professor; D. A. Smith, acting instructor; M. W. Swanson, acting instructor.

Department of mathematics: Howard Garland, instructor.

Medical school: Dr. Elisha Atkins, associate professor of medicine; Dr. Jerome Grunt, associate professor of pediatrics; Dr. George F. Thornton, instructor in medicine.

Department of philosophy: Robert S. Brumbaugh, professor; David Carr, acting instructor; Charles W. Hendel, professor emeritus; T. K. Scott, Jr., assistant professor; Paul Weiss, professor.

Department of physics: Joseph E. Rothberg, instructor.

Department of psychiatry: Dr. Theodore Lidz.

Department of psychology: Barry E. Collins, assistant professor; Doris K. Collins, research associate; E. E. Kriekhaus, assistant professor.

Department of sociology: Roy C. Treadway, acting instructor.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 21, 1965]

TRUE ASSESSMENT

TO THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

I was a junior officer of the 20th Indian Division (under the command of the late Gen. Sir Douglas D. Gracey) and arrived in Saigon from Burma in September 1945.

We were welcomed by the Annamites—placards from the airport to the town center (Rue Catinat) were marked "Welcome to the Allies, to the British and to the Americans—but we have no room for the French."

The government was being run efficiently by the Popular Front of Vietminh groups—to whom Emperor Bao Dai had abdicated in August 1945.

On September 23, the Free French (not Vichy French), without warning to anyone, seized all the public buildings such as the Palais de Justice, the post office, the power station, etc., and hosted the French Tricolor.

There followed 10 days of negotiation between the British—who had only one Gurkha battalion of 20th Indian Division to support them (the rest of the division was traveling from Burma by sea)—under the command of Brigadier Taunton—and the Vietminh. No conclusion was reached, and the Vietminh groups withdrew, determined to fight for the freedom of French Indochina in accordance with the ideas of the Atlantic Charter, well known to them, also of General de Gaulle's Brazzaville speech of 1943 offering independence to French Indochina after the war.

General Gracey then took under his command the Japanese surrendered personnel (under Field Marshal Count Teramichi) in order to defend Saigon-Cholon from the Vietminh who attacked each night.

I personally had a Colonel Endo and Lieutenant Colonel Muarata report to me as the ammunition and transport officer of the 20th Indian Division each morning, and we

sent lend-lease U.S. vehicles to redeploy the Japanese forces for the defense, and also issued more weapons to them (including 3-inch British mortars which had been captured in February 1942, in Singapore).

For 2 months (October and November, 1945) the Vietminh suffered severe casualties in constant attacks on these Japanese troops and the 20th Indian Division. Thus was a bridgehead secured for the arrival of General Leclerc and his Foreign Legion troops from Madagascar.

The present war stems directly from these events.

Personally I have no doubt that the legitimate government of Saigon in September 1945, was that of the Vietminh who had resisted the Japanese during the occupation—with the help of OSS supplies parachuted to them in 1943, 1944, and 1945.

This is a piece of missing history. I believe its public airing may help the American people make a correct decision about the future of their relations with Vietnam.

I am not a Communist, nor even a supporter of the British Labor Party, but a subscribing member of the Tory Party—yet I believe no true assessment of the situation is possible without the information I have outlined above.

ROBERT DENTON WILLIAMS.

ASBINGTON, NORTHAMPTON, ENGLAND.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 20, 1965]

INTERNATIONAL PRESSURES TO HALT BOMBING RAIDS IN NORTH VIETNAM CONTINUING TO INCREASE—IN THIS CONTEXT, CANADIAN MEETS THANT TODAY—FUTURE OF U.N. SAID TO BE LINKED TO ASIAN CRISIS

(By Donald Grant)

International pressures to halt bombing of North Vietnam as a condition for negotiations to end the war are increasing in the United Nations. Most diplomats believe that the pressures will continue to increase.

The Canadian Minister of External Affairs, Paul Martin, is lunching with Secretary General U Thant today. Canadian policy is clear on the subject of bombing North Vietnam—and important, as Canada is a member of the three-nation international control commission for Vietnam. The other two are India and Poland.

Poland, a Communist country, follows a straight anti-American policy on the whole Vietnamese issue. Until recently, India tended to join with Canada in a more moderate position.

President Lyndon B. Johnson has become irritated—and let it be known that he was—with both Canada's and India's present positions. He has evidenced a similar irritation with Thant's attitude.

This is a part of the background of Canadian Minister of External Affairs Martin's visit with Thant today.

Lester B. Pearson, the Prime Minister of Canada, was active in U.N. affairs for many years. He was the choice of the United States for first Secretary General of the organization when it was founded 20 years ago.

The cause of President Johnson's irritation with Canadian policy was a speech given by Pearson in Philadelphia, April 2.

At that time Pearson suggested that a "suspension in the airstrikes against North Vietnam, at the right time, might provide the Hanoi authorities with an opportunity, if they wish to take it, to inject some flexibility into their policy without appearing to do so as the direct result of military pressure."

Thant has refrained, so far, from making a direct appeal for a cease-fire to avoid further White House irritation. At his press conference last Thursday, however, Thant was asked how he would assess Pearson's efforts in behalf of peace in Vietnam. Thant replied that he had "high esteem" for Pearson, for his proposals already made and for those he might make in the future.

The same "high esteem" phrase was used by the Secretary General's spokesman to characterize Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, yesterday, after Fulbright's statement advocating a halt in American airstrikes against North Vietnam.

Thant, again, refrained from endorsing Fulbright's suggestion, but his spokesman said that the Secretary General valued the Senator's "vision, wisdom, and approach to international problems."

Tomorrow, the United Nations Disarmament Commission will meet—including representatives of all 114 members of the world organization. The meeting will be only for the purpose of organizing the session, but when regular meetings begin, next Monday, the situation in Vietnam and the American bombings of North Vietnam are expected to be major subjects of debate.

Thursday, the 33-nation committee considering the problem of U.N. peacekeeping operations will hold an open meeting. Vietnam may or may not enter the discussion at this session, but most diplomats here see a close connection between the future of the U.N. and its inability, so far, to tackle the problem of ending the war in Vietnam. Among such diplomats is Canada's Minister of External Affairs.

"We are facing, at this moment," Martin said last week in Montreal, "one of the most serious crises we have faced since the end of the Second World War. It is not a crisis which has come upon us suddenly. As Canadians—as members of the international commission—we have watched that crisis build up in Vietnam over the past 10 years. It has now reached the point of open conflict."

"It has reached the point where that conflict, by the progression of stroke and counterstroke, could expand beyond the limits of control."

"In such a situation the interests of the international community are deeply engaged. We would be right to expect, therefore, that the international community would bring its influence to bear upon that situation. And the channel that comes to mind for doing that is, of course, the United Nations."

Martin expressed his regret that the U.N. had not been able to act. In another part of his speech he urged "universal membership" for the U.N.—a phrase meaning that all nations, including Communist China, should be members so the organization would be able to act in crises such as the present one.

The Canadian minister pointed out that "the good offices of the Secretary General have been available to the parties throughout this critical situation." He said that he was "hopeful that the Secretary General will be able to play an important part in carrying forward the imaginative and far-reaching proposals now under consideration for the cooperative development of the whole region of southeast Asia."

Martin's chief, Pearson, along with Paul Hoffman of the U.N., advanced the economic development plan later taken up by President Johnson. The U.N.—after peace is established—may play a large role in this plan. The Canadians, however, believe that the United Nations must be active in the political search for peace, as well as acting as an economic agent, if it is to maintain itself as a viable organization.

Unable to keep the peace, Martin pointed out, the League of Nations "founded on the rock of collective security." Martin then asked: "Are we going to allow, can we afford to allow, the United Nations to share the fate of its predecessor?"

[From the Portland Oregonian, Apr. 25, 1965]

PROPAGANDA CLAIMS JUSTIFIED—ATROCITIES MAR VIETNAM WAR

(By Michael T. Malloy)

(As the war in Vietnam grows more brutal, charges of atrocities committed by each side increase. The Americans and the South

April 26, 1965

Vietnamese claim that the Communist guerrillas have murdered thousands of minor officials since 1961. The Communists trump this by raising the figure to hundreds of thousands tortured and maimed by the government. This dispatch looks beyond the propagandists' claims to the truth that in this war neither side's hands are entirely clean.)

SAIGON.—A squad of Vietcong sneaks silently into a sleeping village. Wearing sandals cut from rubber tires, they pad silently to the house of the village chief, who is loyal to the government in Saigon.

They pull the chief from his bed, wake up the villagers and assemble them in the public square. They pick out one or two more men who are known to have informed the government of their movements.

Then they cut the throats of the men they have chosen.

The villagers who watch will be less eager to talk next time government troops come looking for information about the whereabouts of the Communists.

This is an atrocity of war. So is this:

RED CAPTIVE TORTURED

A Vietnamese Ranger captain squats on the chest of a Vietcong captive and pours water from a rusty tin mug into a towel wrapped around his victim's face.

The Vietcong struggles and gags as the cloth becomes so soaked that only water rushes into his nose and mouth when he gasps for air.

A sergeant slams his heavy combat boot into the prisoner's side. Two enlisted men holding the guerrilla's ankles and legs begin twisting them.

The captain dips his mug into a rusty bucket and ladles out more water. This is an "interrogation" on the battlefield, Vietnamese style.

Late one night in February the Vietcong overrun a district headquarters 70 miles northeast of Saigon.

They lead four American soldiers into nearby jungles.

The Americans are bound. Then begins a systematic beating. Blows rain on the Americans' heads, stomachs, kidneys, legs.

After a time the Americans are shot. Their bodies are left to rot in the jungle. A few days later they are found.

This is an interrogation on the battlefield, Vietcong style.

Chalk up one more atrocity for each side.

WAR TOUCH BUSINESS

War is a rough and tough business. The war for control of the rice-rich plains of South Vietnam is getting to be just as ugly as any that has ever been fought.

When opposing groups of men contest a piece of land with guns, planes, bombs, napalm, mortars, and artillery, elements of terror are bound to play a role in the conflict.

Who is committing these atrocities? This is war.

Vietnamese Armed Forces Regulation 609-TT-20 says:

"No torture of any kind is allowed to be performed with the prisoners in order to get information from them."

But a wily little Vietnamese lieutenant with a chestful of combat ribbons says:

"The government sometimes looks in the other direction."

It looked in the other direction a few months ago when infantrymen of the 21st Division pulled six Vietcong soldiers out of a foxhole and handed them over to the battalion commander.

Bullets were still whizzing overhead. The battalion was trying to regroup for an attack. The commander handed them over to a middle-aged sergeant with a nod of the head.

The sergeant marched them to a small canal and shot them all.

The government was looking away last month when a Vietnamese Marine Corps lieutenant looped a pink towel around a prisoner's neck and ordered two husky Marines to play tug-of-war with the towel.

It was looking away when a ranger unit operating in mountain country north of Saigon a few weeks ago found three wounded Vietcong in a bamboo grove after a fierce battle and shot them all simply to avoid the labor of carrying them back to base.

This sort of murder in the field reflects the grim economics of war.

The battalion commander could have saved his six prisoners. It would have cost him three or four men to do it, though, because they would have had to be guarded.

The beating of prisoners is ignored and sometimes condoned by the American advisers who accompany the Vietnamese into battle.

"If I had to choose between beating up a guy or being killed by his buddies, I'd take torture every time," said an American Army sergeant riding with this correspondent on a helicopter assault into the central highlands a few months back.

BRUTAL BEATINGS PRACTICAL

The object of beating a prisoner is to get desperately needed information.

The prisoner who gagged and struggled under the ranger captain's water torture was a Vietcong regular. His age and his full kit of equipment, indicated he might be a senior officer.

The captain who squatted on his chest wanted desperately to know whether he was about to be attacked by the hundreds of Vietcong who had quite obviously just left the thatch and bamboo training camp where the prisoner was seized.

A man's brutality depends on his emotions. If his life is in danger, if he has just seen a friend shot down by the man he is about to question, he is less likely to be kind to his prisoner.

A Vietnamese paratrooper with 12 years of combat experience says:

"It depends on the battle. If the paratroopers go on an operation and none of them gets hurt, then the prisoners are lucky.

"If one of the paratroopers gets killed, then nobody can guarantee the lives of those prisoners."

The Vietcong, it is often said here, practice unspeakable savagery in order to retain, through terror, the cooperation of villagers.

The Americans say more than 20,000 village chiefs have been killed since 1961.

They tell of guerrillas impressing hundreds of peasants for coolie labor to help them move supplies and of hundreds more to fight in their battles.

The Vietcong have even begun attacking American civilians here perhaps as a way to terrorize the Americans themselves. They have blown up a ball park, a movie theater and the American Embassy in the past year and a half. They have captured at least two civilian aid officials and three missionaries.

One aid official was shot when he refused to return to Vietcong captivity after having escaped once and been caught.

But it seems evident that if the Communists have learned savagery, it has been at least partly a lesson from the Vietnamese Government itself.

DIEM REGIME HARD

There was, of course, the 9-year reign of Ngo Dinh Diem, who shipped thousands of political opponents to Poulo Condore, a tropical prison island off the coast, who raided Buddhist pagodas, who ordered his troops to fire on Buddhist mobs, who packed up thousands of peasants bag and baggage and moved them into strategic hamlets that were little better than prison camps.

But even after Diem was ousted and assassinated in November 1963, the government

continued to be, perhaps, somewhat less than humane.

The case of Le Dua, a terrorist who was caught this month in a Da Nang hotel used as an American billet with 5 pounds of plastique crammed in a transistor radio case is only the most recent example.

Le Dua's trial was postponed for several days running, while he "sang like a canary" as one of the U.S. officials put it. When he finally did show up, he was sporting a thoroughly blackened eye that twitched in its socket periodically. And he was still groggy from the effects of sodium pentathol truth serum.

Yet there remain signs of hope. The Vietnamese are anything but a barbarous people at heart. When the last bullet has been spent and the last knife sheathed, their good nature bubbles back to the surface like a jet of clear water in a muddy pool.

POINT RICHMOND, CALIF.,
April 26, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support your stand on our country's course of action on South Vietnam.

DANIEL BREWER.

ENCINITAS, CALIF.,
April 25, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Never regret what you are doing. No monuments perhaps but love from us all.

ELIZABETH B. NEWTON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 24, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Warmest congratulations and thanks for urging peaceful settlement and denouncing odious and senseless war.

J. F. DELORD.

SUDBURY, MASS.,
April 24, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your stand regarding U.S. activities in Vietnam.

ELIZABETH and WILLIAM WARREN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
April 25, 1965

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard your speech on Vietnam. Agree with you 100 percent. Keep American people informed.

Mrs. SYLVIA WARNER.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL,
Baltimore, Md., March 10, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support you in your stand on Vietnam. I have supported you as long ago as 1962, which year was spent as an American adviser in Saigon. Last year, when you dissented from the carte-blanche approval of the President's actions in Asia, I was in sympathy with you. Having left the Navy in December, I now feel free to openly declare my thoughts.

Three years ago, the assistance to Vietnam had certain clandestine overtones, designed to conceal our efforts from the ICC and vocal critics such as yourself. The ability of the military to thus act outside the interests and intent of the people was partially instrumental in my decision to resign. Casualty figures and troop numbers were handled with utmost care to avoid frightening the public, until the election campaign pointed to the need for popular support. It seems that, knowing American respect for our boys,

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8169

the administration found it convenient to dwell on the hardships and casualties. The course of policy has changed from concealment to involvement as public emotion is mustered to quell critics. In this atmosphere of growing hysteria, it seems especially important to congratulate you on your courage.

Although the Constitution reserves for Congress the privilege of declaring war, historically Executive action followed by public indignation have lead Congress to the point where no alternative was open to it short of war. Now, before we replace "Jerry" and "Jap" in our vocabulary of hate with "VC" and "Chink," it is important that reasonable opposition be heard. If the American mind is molded to a just war in Asia and Cuba, then the U.N. and world peace become concepts for another generation to define.

Although I am no longer a constituent since I left the Navy, I will continue to regard you as my Senator so long as you continue to speak from your conscience. Today you may be called a character of a man, but it is of no importance if in the long run you are remembered as a man of character.

Very truly,

MELVIN E. GOVIG,
Director, Medical Record Services.

GREATER PORTLAND
COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Portland, Oreg., April 12, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The burden of decision regarding Vietnam which you must shoulder is grievous and we would not add to it. We, the board of directors of the Greater Portland Council of Churches, wish to aid and support you.

We support you fully in your statement of April 7 concerning your desire to follow the way of unconditional negotiation. We are pleased that you have stated forthrightly your ultimate goal of just peace through negotiation for the Vietnam conflict. Your offer of \$1 billion in aid to eradicate hunger in southeast Asia, to be channeled through the United Nations, is heartening.

On the other hand, for some time we have been perturbed by the escalation of the war in Vietnam for fear it might advance beyond the point of no return. As a Christian body, we have deplored the increasing loss of life, the use of napalm bombs and gas—even though of a nonlethal action—which awaken horror in all parts of the world, and even in our allies.

May God in His graciousness guide you as you lead our Nation to a peaceful negotiation of the Vietnam conflict.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. CATE,
Executive Secretary.
PAUL S. WRIGHT,
President.

THE CLEVELAND PRESS,
Cleveland, Ohio, April 22, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is not the first time I have written to you in grateful appreciation for your valiant fights for seemingly unpopular causes. I earnestly hope you will not only continue, but redouble your attempts to awaken the public consciences regarding our reprehensible policy in Vietnam.

I am a lifelong independent Democrat who has lived through two world wars, and I have been a daily newspaper writer for 40 years. Yet now, reluctantly, I have come to the conclusion that the warhawks have their talons imbedded in President Johnson so deeply that it will require a superhuman ef-

fort to persuade him his policies are leading straight to a tremendous bloodletting—probably followed by nuclear annihilation for millions.

The point we must strive to bring home to our people is one on which you have been hammering—that we have grossly violated the 1954 Geneva treaty terms by shipping troops, arms, and munitions into South Vietnam. Also, that we have without apparent shame been as responsible as anyone for the fact that the Diem government never held the 1956 elections called for by the 1954 agreements.

As usual, truth is the first casualty in wartime. The propaganda emanating from Washington is conditioning our people to stand for a war which we had no business entering in the first place.

Our people are told we are in a fight to guarantee the freedom of others. What freedoms? Since the Vietnamese never have been permitted to elect their own governments, how can our country have the crass effrontery to say we are shedding our blood (and spending mounting millions of dollars) for freedom? The poor rice farmer of Vietnam can have no illusions about this situation, or there wouldn't be so many of them who apparently are Vietnamese in the daytime and Vietcong after dark.

That, incidentally, is the exact remark I heard a wounded GI make on TV when he was shipped home—until an officer quickly stepped in and shut him up.

I am among the millions of Americans who are simply crushed by the obvious fact that we really didn't have a choice at the last national elections. We couldn't vote for Goldwater for many reasons, particularly because he was obviously a irresponsible warhawk.

But now look. The man we felt offered us a decent alternative has apparently turned his back on reason. I can never again vote to Lyndon Baines Johnson. The fight for civil rights and the war on poverty are wonderful goals. But what good will it have done for us to achieve them if the world is shortly to be left in ashes?

For the love of heaven, Senator, redouble your efforts. You will have the blessing of history if we can overcome the impending disaster.

Sincerely,

JACK CLOWSER,
Sports Department.

THE GREATER PORTLAND
COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Portland, Oreg., April 14, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have attached a copy of the letter which we sent on April 12 to the President of the United States regarding this situation in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. CATE,
Executive Secretary.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
April 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support the growing numbers of Senators calling for a peaceful solution to end the war in Vietnam. You speak for me when you say "... a continuation of the State Department's policy in South Vietnam is certain to lead to a massive war in Asia ...". We can only do so very little to prevent this but we need to do all that we can and we do admire you for your courage to stand in this day when so many will attempt to do so. Thank you again and take courage. Our thoughts are with you, hoping we have not as yet reached the "point of no return."

Mrs. LORETTA CORDELL.

HELPER PROJECT, INC.,
Goshen, Ind., April 21, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The developments in Vietnam and elsewhere the past few weeks reminds me of the coming of World War I and World War II. I wonder how it looks to you? Because I am sure that I do not have enough of the truth about the situation, I do not want to draw conclusions unduly; but I am confident that the movement of our present foreign policy is heading toward world war III. I want to see it stopped and I know you do too. How to get it done is my big question.

It looks as though the "military-industrial complex" of which President Eisenhower warned has been having a real field day. I was surprised a few months ago to read in our local paper, the "Elkhart Truth" (a fairly conservative paper), the story about the "Missile Gap of Sixties, A Myth of History" by Everett S. Allen. Here was given—about 5 years too late—the story of how the American people were fooled into accepting a \$17 billion increase of our missiles. I wonder if a similar deal is being worked out behind the scenes again. Can you find out the truth for me?

Not at all cynical about the present administration (at least yet) I think they are taking the whole world in the direction of destruction. I believe President Johnson honestly means to offer all of this help to southeast Asia after the hostilities cease, but I doubt that many people over there will believe it. And if this is allowed to escalate into a major war the human race is probably doomed. This is what Dr. Otto Hahn told me in his office in Göttingen, Germany, in 1959, "Any major war will be a nuclear war and a nuclear war is likely to destroy all of mankind."

It seems to me a little handful of you Senators there at Washington might be able to work together and turn the tide. It seems to me of critical importance.

If I can do anything out here at grassroots please let me know.

Cordially,

DAN WEST.

P.S.—Can you do anything to help the U.N. meeting on disarmament now? I should hate to see that fail.

WICHITA, KANS.,
April 21, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: According to our Constitution only Congress has the power to declare war. However, the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, can involve us in undeclared war not necessarily approved by the American people. It is time an amendment be made to the Constitution which will protect the people from the trigger-happy politicians.

Sincerely,

DON BLAINE.

LA CROSSE, WIS.,
April 19, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senators from Oregon and Alaska,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE AND SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to say that I agree completely with your stand on Vietnam. I am only 15 years old and can't do much but I read with interest what you have said. In our classroom at school, I am the only one that agrees completely with your stand. I don't know if this is due to the fact that this area is heavily Republican, but I am surprised at anyone advocating war. We should have learned in Korea. You don't know

8170

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 26, 1965

what the Red Chinese will do if they do have the atomic bomb now. I am a Democrat and worked with Young Democrats last year to help elect President Johnson and other candidates. However, I don't like his Vietnam policy. I hope the President will press for negotiation and you will continue your stand on South Vietnam. I am also interested in going into politics some day. Do you have any information on a career in politics? I would appreciate any information you might have.

Sincerely yours,
CHRISTOPHER KUECHMANN.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
April 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:
In your stand on the Vietnamese situation you speak for other citizens of United States like myself.

ANNETTE SILBERT.
NORTHVILLE, MICH.,
April 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am with you in all your efforts to stop the Vietnam war. It seems incredible that our country could be pushing such an outmoded, vicious, and dangerous military effort. I hope Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion of a temporary lull will be pushed in Congress and gain the ear of the President. Many thanks, and please keep up the fight for peace.

Respectfully,
ALICE M. WOODRUFF.

THE SMALL ANIMAL CLINIC,
Cleveland, Ohio, April 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue to speak out against the bombing of North Vietnam—the local newspapers rarely carry your comments except to criticize them.

Is there any way of being placed on your mailing list to obtain the full text of your statements?

Yours for a saner world.
Sincerely,

Mrs. D. A. RICKARDS.
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
April 19, 1965.

Senator W. MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: You have many people behind you. Please keep informing the U.S. people about the truth in Vietnam. As you said, we must deal with the rebels in South Vietnam before we can have peace. It is a civil war and we must deal with that reality first.

Congratulations and keep it up.
Sincerely,

Mrs. A. W. WALKER.
ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Senator MORSE,
United States of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I thank you from the bottom of my heart for speaking out and warning the American people about the war in Vietnam. If only there were more Senators like you.

Sincerely,
JANET M. HANNAN.
RICHMOND, VA.,
April 20, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one of your long-time admirers, I must take pen in hand and urge you to step up your well known

opinions by more and more public expressions.

It is not that you have been correct from the first, but that the entrance of North Vietnam openly in the conflict will also bring in Red China. Then we will be at war. That is exactly what you were saying long ago.

My background has been on all other matters a strong supporter of the Johnson and Kennedy administrations. I say this to show I am deeply sincere in my support of you and your position.

Now is the time, Senator Morse, for a demonstration of genuine statesmanship and you possess all the prerequisites so rarely found in one person: character, integrity, intelligence, oratorical ability, and knowledge.

Seriously you must step out and keep the story in front of the American people before it is too late.

Sincerely,
LEONARD HIZER.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
April 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am a Christian laywoman and I am very concerned about the situation in Vietnam. I am aware of your opposition to administration policies. I would like to express my approval and let you know that I am behind you. The only answer to the problems of the world is the love of Christ for all men. We need more people who will at least try to put that love into action both in private and public life. May you find strength from God to continue your stand.

Sincerely,
Mrs. DAVID KRAFT.
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with your views on Vietnam. I only wish there would exist less aggressive men in our executive branch. Please continue your fight against hypocrisy and war.

JOHN PAGGIOLI.
CHICAGO, ILL.,
April 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: This is to belatedly thank you for the frank exposition of your views while we were riding in from the airport for you to make your address to the Warsaw ghetto memorial meeting. I must confess I was considerably shaken by your feeling that the movement is toward attack on Chinese bases, leading inevitably to general war. The average citizen, as you can well imagine, faces nothing but frustration when up against the alternatives of doing nothing, marching in peace parades, or writing letters to his representatives, the latter bringing canned replies with which, in my case, you must be well familiar. Despite this, I have again written as per the attached, to Senators DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN. Is there anything to be gained from such efforts? Do you recommend any more meaningful action?

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP BRAIL.
APRIL 19, 1965.

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I have written you on previous occasion voicing opposition to U.S. conduct of affairs in Vietnam. I have carefully read your replies, and some of your speeches in the Senate, and am mindful of the fact that there is too wide a divergence of opinion to be narrowed by the enforced limitations of a letter. Let me say only that my opinions developed only after wide reading on the French Indochina background, the

1954 agreement, and subsequent developments, as well as constant reading of American news reports, supplemented by English and French, which are much more complete. Such reading just doesn't confirm the fixed American position that the struggle is an invasion from the north, which Hanoi could turn off at will, even if it so willed.

Be that as it may, and recognizing that no exposition by me is likely to temper your views toward those of your Senate colleagues Morse, Gruening, and others, may I make this suggestion which seems possible of acceptance by both sides. A Geneva conference on Cambodia could assemble all the countries concerned with Vietnam, and permit informal exchanges. This could provide a way to get around the hurdles of "face" and preconditions. While the conference would formally deal with Cambodia, both sides could put out feelers for a Vietnam settlement.

Reports in the New York Times and the St. Louis Post Dispatch, and recent books by Pulitzer Prize winners Browne (AP) and Halberstrom (New York Times) makes it clear that in South Vietnam, we have a most unstable and unpopular ally, that any hope of a clear-cut victory by us for them is hopeless, and that our losses are much greater than publicized. Peace is to the mutual interest of all parties including us, and its pursuit is therefore your obligation as well as mine. The President certainly seems to want it. Wouldn't a Cambodian conference open the way?

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP BRAIL.

AMERICAN BAPTIST CAMPUS
MINISTRY IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif., March 30, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During this month a number of us have engaged in fasting, each for 48 hours, as—(1) in repentance for our share, unwilling though it is, in the brutal, barbarous, illegal, and immoral war in Vietnam; and (2) as a deep expression of our concern that negotiation and economic and social aid may take the place of military escalation there.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE L. COLLINS.

BRUNSWICK, MAINE,
April 21, 1965

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not one of your constituents, I want to thank you for speaking out about our present folly in Vietnam. Why are so few people in Washington criticizing this continuing insanity?

I feel sure that a major reason why States such as Maine turned down Goldwater so heartily was the fear that he might do in Vietnam just what the present administration is doing.

As Norman Thomas said on Monday evening in Brunswick, "Goldwater being dead yet speaketh."

More power to you.
Yours sincerely,
CECIL T. HOLMES.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
April 21, 1965.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We write to express our approval of your deep questions and objections to the administration's foreign "policy" in Vietnam. We agree that the trouble there is one of a civil war nature; that we have violated the Geneva accords of 1954; that the administration has given no good reasons for our present bombings in North Vietnamese territory. We especially wish to praise you for your Johns Hopkins address.

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8171

Sorry that this is so short. We have just written more lengthy letters (but not of praise) to the President and to several Senators, urging the latter to join your stand.

WM. G. BOARDMAN,
ROBERT BAKER,
Instructors.

PIERMONT, N.Y.,
April 21, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Though not a constituent of yours, I want to express my thanks and admiration to you for your consistent and courageous stand on Vietnam. I only wish more Senators and others in the Government had your insight and courage.

More power to you, and good luck.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM W. STAFFORD.

WOODBURY, CONN.,
April 21, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How glad we are, how thankful to have at least a few of you who are holding firm in your opposition to the war in South Vietnam.

This is just to send a word of encouragement as you make your stand these days. I hope somehow you will be able to persuade some of the other Congressmen of the folly of our involvement in this Vietnamese civil war.

Respectfully yours,

EBEN T. CHAPMAN.

URBANA, ILL.,
April 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your career in the Senate has been one that I have admired for what must be close to 20 years by now.

But at no time have your courage, diligence, and honesty been more apparent than in your struggle to speak the truth about Vietnam.

If we manage somehow to pull out of this morass I am sure that the Nation will be in your debt.

Thank you for being a good Senator.

Sincerely,

GENE GILMORE.

BOSTON, MASS.,
April 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You may wonder, as the escalation grows of our attack against North Vietnam and our commitment to a military "solution" increases, if your effort is worthwhile. I hope that you will take strength from the knowledge that thousands of Americans depend upon the lone stand of you and Senator GRUENING as the voices of realism in our confused political scene. May you find the patience and fortitude necessary to discover means of convincing adequate numbers of your colleagues in the Senate to a real desire for a solution to the dangerous conflict in southeast Asia.

Yours sincerely,

ALICK BARTHOLOMEW.

ATHENS, OHIO,
April 21, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Stand firm, stand firm, and stand firm.

There are many of us who are appalled and ashamed at what the United States is doing in Vietnam. You are right, we do not belong there with our bombs and gas. Make

a speech on the Senate floor every day to keep us all from becoming lulled into acceptance of the situation.

We enjoyed your speech at Ohio University.

Sincerely yours,

MARJORIE S. STONE.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
April 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I fully support your stand against extending the Vietnam war, and I hope you will continue to state your views.

Thank you also for the letter which you sent to the St. Louis Rally for Peace in Vietnam on April 21, 1965.

Support for your position is growing, but there is an incredible amount of misinformation circulated by the news media in regard to the war going on in Vietnam. Also, there is a general feeling that the Government possesses secret information which is not at the ordinary citizen's disposal and without which he cannot formulate an opinion.

Your words do much to dispell a general feeling of irresponsibility on the part of the public.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

MIRIAM R. KAY.

AUSTIN, TEX.,
April 19, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to thank you for your continuing courage and honesty about our policy in Vietnam. If only there were more like you in the Congress.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT ESTES.

GREENWICH, CONN.,
April 22, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to express my admiration for your candor—and stamina—on the question of Vietnam.

We say we are fighting for freedom in that unhappy land.

Yet, for the last 9 years, we have opposed free elections to reunify both Vietnams.

And hardly any of our free world allies warmly support our military adventures there.

It's argued that if we pulled out now and permitted honest elections under U.N. auspices, we'd lose face. Actually, however, our prestige falls with every napalm bomb.

You're a brave man to stand up to the "hawks" and speak the truth.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN PAMPAL.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
April 23, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For the past several weeks I have discussed with many of the customers I call on in Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Iowa in my work as a steel salesman for the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. our Nation's role in South Vietnam. I have been somewhat surprised at their opinion, for almost to a man they have all expressed their complete rejection of our role in this troubled area. Few can find any reason for our being there and most feel that the conflict may escalate into a general nuclear war.

I must say that I tend to agree with their reaction and want to urge you to continue to use your good offices to see what can be done to reduce our aggressive actions in Asia and bring reason to bear on this needless and dangerous conflict.

You and Senator GRUENING seem to be the only ones with enough good sense and courage to speak up in this crucial hour. We salute you.

Yours for the democratic way of life,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT W. MCCOY.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
April 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Though I am not a constituent of yours, please count me as a supporter in your forthright campaign to pound some sense into our makers of foreign policy in regard to the dangerous and stupid situation in Vietnam.

How can we hope for peace while dropping napalm on civilians? Say we seek conferences on ending the war while we spread it northward? Ask for a lessening of tension when we pour more men, weapons, and planes into the Vietnam civil war?

We sleep better knowing that you and your like-minded associates are keeping an eye on the war hawks in the Department of State and the Pentagon.

Sincerely,

TRAVIS K. HEDRICK.

MIAMI, FLA.,
April 22, 1965.

EDITOR THE HERALD: In recent months we have witnessed in our country almost every conceivable sort of protest, both violent and nonviolent, against our war policy in Vietnam. They have ranged in violence up to the maximum protest of self-immolation by fire, and in size to the great 20,000-person April 17 march on Washington, and to literally millions of letters written to the President, to Congressmen, and to the editors of our daily newspapers.

Despite this magnitude, and depth, and force of protest, our administration sees fit to further escalate this ugly war. What then is to happen now? When people feel so strongly about this issue that they are willing to burn themselves alive in protest, will they simply fold their tents and steal away into the night when their protests are ignored? I do not believe so, especially since there is the lingering, burning, shameful, and comparatively recent example of apathy the German people showed toward the inhumanities perpetrated by the Nazi government under Hitler.

It is my considered opinion that if we persist further on our present course in Vietnam, that we can expect violence of a substantial nature to manifest itself in our country by our own people. I believe this violence will be directed at first against the production facilities, transportation, and communications facilities, military establishments, utilities, and our national shrines. Beyond this I do not even like to think.

Is it worth this much to prove our virility? Or, can it be that when proving it becomes so important to us, that perhaps it is because we have already lost it?

REYNOLDS MOODY.

DAVIS, CALIF., April 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I am very grateful for the reasonable and courageous stand you have taken with respect to our country's military actions in Vietnam.

I hope you will recognize that there are a significant number of people in the United States who do support you. I hope you will not be tempted to compromise your stand.

May God guide and comfort you.

Yours sincerely,

ANDREW C. MILLS.

MEDIMONT, IDAHO, April 20, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Would like to commend you for your stand on the Vietnam war. The majority of people I have talked with about this agree with me but doubt if 95

8172

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 26, 1965

percent of them would take the trouble to write. So I could safely say that the greater number of the common people condemn President Johnson's and McNamara's war.

Am aware that you may be very busy and if you do not answer all your mail it's okay.
Very truly yours,

E. H. HANSON.

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.,
April 23, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I congratulate—and thank—you with all my heart for your opposition to this Vietnam madness? It seems that nobody outside Washington, either in the United States or the rest of the world, approves of our present actions there. The administration seems to have sold out to the Army brass, who are always stupid. Also, they love war and don't mind in the least how much of other people's blood (or money) they spend.

Do please stick to your guns.

Your sincerely,

R. CROWLEY.

MERCER ISLAND, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin insisted on unanimity—that is "yes men." It is heartening to learn that there's a few brave representatives left to indicate an alternative course to the present one which history will indict President Johnson as the cat's paw for reaction.

Respectfully yours,

HOMER HENDERICKSON.

P.S.—Is it too late for a democratic solution such as indicated by the Geneva Convention of 1954—a commitment we ignored and which we are trying to cover with bombs.

GAINESVILLE, FLA.,
April 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was shocked to read today of the possibility that 100,000 U.S. troops will be committed to South Vietnam. If Evans and Novak are to be believed U.S. Senators have already been briefed on this decision. I can only consider such an action to be one of unprecedented body. In general the U.S. policy toward Vietnam has been distinguished only by its lack of moral basis and intellect. I can only hope that Senator FULBRIGHT's proposal for temporary cessation of bombing will be adopted and a serious attempt made to negotiate.

Respectfully yours,

E. S. MATALKA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to endorse Mr. Matalka's views in this matter and to add that it is with considerable relief that at long last you seem to be opposing the apparent escalation of the southeast Asian crises. Please continue to take the stand that the Nation has come to expect of you in these matters.

Sincerely,

W. E. BOBLITT.

I am in complete agreement with Mr. Matalka in this matter.

MARK W. OTTEN,
EDWIN E. BURKETT.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
April 21, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Through your continuing exposure of administration claptrap, hypocrisy, and dishonesty about Vietnam you are performing a great service to world civilization and humanity itself. Your honesty and courage has certainly inspired many Americans, has been a very crucial factor, I think, in creating what is beginning to look like a real mass movement of protest in the

United States against actions of our Government that are both stupid and hideous.

HAROLD B. JAMISON.

ABERDEEN, WASH.,
April 21, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Our war in Vietnam is doing more to bring on socialism in this country than anything since the depression. People in every group you get into are discussing the right and wrong of our military policy in Asia. I only know of one man in this town who is willing to defend what is being done, and he is connected with the John Birch Society. Even he has to admit, in the final analysis, that he thinks what we are doing is politically expedient rather than right.

At a basketball game the other night when we stood for flag salute, not over a dozen people stood at attention and only a few made a feeble attempt to salute or to even look at our flag. Parents and students alike seemed depressed.

It is somewhat more difficult to brainwash people now than it used to be; folks know that we have an interest in tin, tungsten and oil in southeast Asia. They also know that the foreign press tells us things that are later admitted by our Government when convenient. In fact, people feel that they voted against what we are doing in Asia last November. Many will never vote again for anyone. They feel that it is of no use.

Is it true that we have had a military coup in the United States of America and that you do not dare try to control the military? Many people seem to think so. If this is true, would it not be better to let us, the people, know so we could help and try to do what is right and to protect you?

Sincerely,

MAXINE ACKER.

Copy to HENRY M. JACKSON, WAYNE MORSE,
Senator GRUENING.

JOHNSTOWN, PA.,
April 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It's too bad that we cannot have a majority in the Senate of men with your good sense in international affairs.

Let's get the hell out of Vietnam.

Best of wishes to you, and keep after the nit-wits.

ARTHUR JOHNSTON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
April 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We thank you deeply for your struggle in behalf of the honor of our country and the rights and welfare of people, everywhere.

Gratefully yours,

ARTHUR and HELEN BERTHOLF.

SUNNYVALE, CALIF.,
April 22, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter that I have sent to President Johnson regarding our current southeast Asia policy.

I realize that you have already spoken out against the present expansion of the war in Vietnam, however, please attempt to further seek methods of enticing our Government to adopt a responsible approach to world leadership.

My own recommended approach to the problem in Vietnam has been described in an earlier communication, however, almost

any form of resolution is preferable to our present blind, obstinate, dictatorial and potentially disastrous policy.

Sincerely,

BYRON F. MISCHKE.

SUNNYVALE, CALIF.,
April 21, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Please consider the adoption of a policy encompassing reason, honor and compassion in Vietnam.

I do not favor withdrawal, or even negotiation necessarily, however, our present premeditated attacks upon the northern portion of the country are no less a criminal act than those of the Viet Cong terrorists. Indeed they are perhaps of a greater degree of viciousness due to our overwhelmingly superior power.

Because of the arbitrary approach of the United States to the solution of an international problem, I have all but lost faith in the intents and purposes of this country in the modern world. For the first time in my life I am actually ashamed of my National Government.

Please, sir, direct our strength and resources into a course of action which will bring honor, respect, and the gratitude of all people who are presently innocent victims of our capacity for death and destruction.

Sincerely,

BYRON F. MISCHKE.

Copy to Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER, Senator WAYNE MORSE, and Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

APRIL 19, 1965.

EDITOR,
San Francisco Call-Bulletin,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SIR: There are many things that are disturbing to me about what is happening in Vietnam. Almost each day brings some incident that is either shocking, or else leaves me with the dim feeling that would have been considered shocking in some earlier, more innocent, time.

But to me the most striking point of all is that we claim to be acting there, not for reasons of narrow self interest, but out of moral considerations. The President has spoken eloquently to the point that we want nothing for ourselves in southeast Asia, that we are there only because of commitment to our friends, that we want only that they be allowed to choose their own government without outside interference.

What can he mean by this? Who are the friends he refers to? Are they the people of South Vietnam? Or are they the members of the sequence of more or less unsavory regimes which we have instituted and supported and which have been unable to obtain the confidence of the majority of the people of South Vietnam?

Perhaps the answer to this question of who are our friends can be seen in the history of the past few years. If we have any commitment in Vietnam at all, it is to the Geneva agreement, which we had pledged to carry out. The history is complicated and there were violations of the terms by both sides. But one point stands out as being of overwhelming importance. According to the terms of the agreement, the split between North and South Vietnam was to be temporary. Nationwide elections were to be held with the object of uniting the country under a single government. When it became clear to us that the regime we favored in Saigon had not much more support in the South than in the North, and would lose in any election, no elections were held. So much for our commitment to self determination for the people of Vietnam.

In view of this, I would be more comfortable of the President, in discussing our role

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8173

in southeast Asia, spoke in terms of national self-interest rather than moral commitment, and posed the question of whether it is indeed in our self interest to be in Vietnam? To my mind, compelling arguments that it is not in our interest to be there have been given; e.g., by Senators MORSE and CHURCH. But if the administration insists that the matter is one of moral commitment rather than national interest, sensible dialog is impossible.

Even worse, the administration has made it clear that dialog is unwelcome. Members of Congress who have taken a strong stand against our actions in Vietnam have not been gently treated by the administration. There have been increasing restrictions on reporting out of Vietnam and even a few flagrant instances of harassment of reporters. The unhealthy and undemocratic attitude of "only the experts can decide such complicated matters" has been fostered.

But in spite of all this, or perhaps even in part as a response to the challenge, there has been an increasing expression of concern. People, for a great variety of reasons, are standing up and saying "enough." In spite of the awful circumstances which have led to it I find this protest an exciting thing and an indication of health in a society for which many had feared.

Sincerely yours,

KAREL DELEEUW.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
April 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We appreciate your courage and integrity in maintaining your opposition on Vietnam. We are dismayed that President Johnson has accepted Goldwater's trigger-happy position.

You speak for many quiet people who despair because their President has declared war without their consent or even that of their Congress.

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN SVEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
April 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I feel I must write to congratulate you on your brave speech, which I heard on the radio this morning, regarding the war in Vietnam.

I wholeheartedly agree that the moral position of the United States has been seriously compromised by its escalation of the war. In the last analysis, people and nations are judged by what they do, not by what they say; and the actions of the United States in Vietnam directly contradict our supposed desire for peaceful settlement of international problems. Indeed, I am beginning to wonder if our desire for peace is not merely a desire for the kind of peace which prevails when one group, through naked power, can enforce its viewpoint upon the rest of mankind.

I hope you realize that your voice is finding many responsive listeners in the United States. The purpose of this letter is to encourage you to keep on speaking, loudly and clearly, knowing that many people share your convictions, but do not have the opportunity nor the eloquence to give them direct expression.

Very sincerely yours,

MRS. GRETCHEN ANN HOAD.

CHEVY CHASE VILLAGE,
Chevy Chase, Md., April 24, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I interpret the news as indicating that many Senators are trou-

bled by the violent course we are pursuing in Asia, and I therefore, direct my appeal to you.

It is my belief that the President's advisers have lost their perspective, and are quite out of touch, in judgment, with intelligent world opinion. I fear that in their intense desire to prove they are right, they will soon commit us to a bloody land war we can never win, on the continent of Asia.

Under the Constitution, I plead to you as a Senator to do all you can to stop this recklessness.

I am not a member of any pressure group, but am not ashamed to say that I am particularly concerned because I have a young son who could be a part of this sacrifice. Certainly I did not agree to commit him to such a war, nor did the Senate under our Constitution. I am confident millions of other citizens feel as I do.

Please insist on a course of sanity before it is too late. That these advisers will "lose face" if our policy is changed, is certainly a matter of no true importance.

Yours, with hope,

JOHN W. MALLEY.

SANTA ANA, CALIF.,
April 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to offer my heartfelt thanks and my support for your rare and welcome voice of sanity in our Government regarding the horrible war in Vietnam.

I have never felt so ashamed, so angry, and so frustrated, probably because I am an American and a Democrat that pounded the precinct pavement to prevent the implementation of the Goldwater policy—and because I'm not sure I would even want to stay the hand of doom that must surely come if we cannot allow life to those who will not run their governments to suit us.

When did we don this mantle of the Aryan supermen? How did we become the judge and executioner of the rest of the world?

Surely there are a few checks and balances left in Washington to halt this course of mad men. And I suggest that the preservation of even one human life is worth all the political wounds that could result through the process of impeachment.

Sincerely yours

R. L. SEIBEL.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
April 22, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please find enclosed a letter I have just written to President Johnson.

Sincerely,

JUDITH BAUMRIN.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
April 22, 1965.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I was one of those who fought hard for your election. I believed that of the many qualities which you brought to the Presidency the most important were caution and patience. You had learned through your many years in the legislature that things worth having are worth striving for carefully, without creating enemies for one's cause along the way. Your many hours of talk with your political opponents usually won them over—gradually.

I believed that in times when our relations with the other nations in the world required delicate, diplomatic, but most of all patient handling, that you would be the man who would fulfill these requirements.

But you, a wise man, have been foolishly advised. President Eisenhower was advised not to engage in direct intervention in Vietnam, and he, a brilliant military man, accepted this advice as sound.

Please, listen to those who would stop this club wielding course we are pursuing. Please hear their arguments. Senators CHURCH, GRUENING, MCGOVERN, and MORSE are all wise and patriotic men. Please, just listen with the best that is in you to what they tell you.

Sincerely,

MRS. BERNARD BAUMRIN.

ORMOND BEACH, FLA.,
April 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: These days you must feel like a man standing on the bank of the Niagara shouting at a boatload of joyriders who are pushing off for a ride to the falls: "Turn back before it is too late" only to get their raucous reply: "We know how to take care of ourselves." Are you in a tiny minority in Washington or are there many others who see clearly the terrible disaster that awaits us and the world if we go to war with China? Are there only a few who discern the futility of trying to solve the problem of communism by war?

Hitler tried to destroy Russian communism by invading Russia and he did succeed in killing 15 million Russians and destroying untold property (secretly abetted by many in the West), but he left a fractured Germany. I was in the Far East when Japan launched her invasion of China with far superior military forces plus the advantage of the camouflage of Oriental features and the ability to live as the Chinese do. They did untold damage but lost their empire. Suppose we do beat China to her knees for a time, can we police the country? Can we support the necessary rehabilitation? To say nothing of survive in history the infamy of such an invasion. Is President Johnson to go down in history as the one who led us into such supreme folly?

I spent 18 years in China, most of it as a professor in the University of Shanghai. After 1900 we built up a great fund of goodwill to our people which has been almost completely dissipated by our policy toward mainland China since the war. Not long ago I received a letter from a Christian physician who is head of surgery in a government hospital in Shanghai asking why our Government took up such an attitude toward the Chinese Government when they were putting into effect many of the things Christians tried to accomplish (universal education and medical service, equality of women, etc.). The antagonism of China toward us is not utterly unreasonable when we consider our support of its enemy—Chiang Kai-shek—on Formosa.

Last night Alsop's column defamed Hans Morgenthau as a pompous ignoramus because he took a position against the war hawks. Your speeches and Senator GRUENING's don't get into our papers. What can we ordinary citizens do to stop the false patriotism that demands that we support every military adventure which our Government undertakes?

Yours sincerely,

GORDON POTEAT.

P.S.—I met you several years ago at a tea in Paul Raymond's home when you came to speak at our Daytona Beach forum. I have long been one of your supporters. (I'm a retiree, 74 years old.)

BROOKINGS, S. DAK.,
April 21, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I read a summary of your address at the Johns Hopkins University in the Hopkins Alumni magazine. I want to go on record for endorsing your

8174

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 26, 1965

remarks. I am afraid the present policy will bring an incident to precipitate an impossible war. Just because a mistake may have been made in a former administration is no reason to intensify this operation.

I admire your courage and sincerity.

Yours very sincerely,

DOUGLAS CHITTICK,
Professor of Rural Sociology,
South Dakota State University.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS.,
April 21, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Do keep on with your messages to the American people over radio, T.V., and in the newspapers. I heard your taped message over the radio this morning, and I think it has powerful appeal to the mothers whose sons may have to give their lives in this unnecessary war, and to mothers who have already lost their sons in battle.

I just want you to know I'm very grateful to you, and a few others in Congress for your keen insight, fairness, and humanitarian sensibilities, in matters dealing with Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALENE FORTIN.

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
April 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend and endorse your publicly stated views on the Vietnamese civil war. As the staunchest critic in the Senate of the administration's policy you have again shown your independence and courage.

My personal views of this situation are incorporated in a letter I have written to President Johnson. I have taken the liberty of enclosing a copy of that letter for you.

Please continue your efforts on behalf of a fair and peaceful solution to this problem.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT G. WUNSCH.

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
April 22, 1965.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am greatly distressed at your policy of continued aggression in the Vietnamese civil war. As a student of this situation for the past several years I continue to be convinced that we are illegally intervening in a situation which is indigenous to South Vietnam. Our destructive efforts there are not in keeping with accepted interpretations of international law, contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Geneva Convention of 1954, and in direct violation of the United Nations Charter.

Your April 7 speech calling for unconditional negotiations was superficially attractive. Upon study, however, it is clear that there were conditions and your protestations of a desire for peace appear to be hollow and quite insincere. Your speech was in reality a sop. It will be used to justify continued American aggression.

You have mentioned many times that the price of appeasement is dear and that aggressor's appetite is never satiated. But because you give the enemy no choice but to appease our increasingly intransigent position, or fight against us, there can be only one logical conclusion. You have dedicated all of our resources to the single purpose of ensnaring China into a general war. This policy of preventive war is Goldwaterism at its worst and deserves the scorn of all thinking people.

If you must lead us into a general Asian war for the single purpose of perpetuating

unchallenged American dominance in Asia you must understand this. You will lead a divided alliance, and worst of all a divided Nation, into that conflict.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT G. WUNSCH.

VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.,
April 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Even after carefully considering information from the most reliable sources available to me, I am not certain that our Vietnamese campaign is serving the best interests of the American people. Does whatever the American people stand to gain in Vietnam merit the costs in their lives, moral standing prestige, security, unification and creation of enemies * * *? All of the American people have placed their trust in you and your colleagues to protect them from sacrifice for causes that do not merit that sacrifice. If there is anything I might do to encourage careful evaluation of goals of our war effort in relation to costs involved, please let me know.

B. D. PHIPPS.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
April 23, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to heartily commend you and all those in the Senate who have protested the illegal presence of U.S. troops in Vietnam.

I believe it was a tragic error for the Senate to give the President a free hand to follow any policy he deemed best in pursuing his undeclared war in that unfortunate country. It is my understanding that the Senate's business is to see that the wishes of the people determine such important decisions especially when it may mean life or death for themselves and the continuation of life on this planet, which this conflict may well decide.

The President has proven himself a person totally ignorant of understanding of the rights of other nations and the consequences of those events for which he is responsible. I do not mean to infer he alone has made decisions, for it is well known the Pentagon has for far too long had a powerful hand in governmental affairs of this country. This should cease. I believe it to be unconstitutional.

It now appears all the progress made toward better relations with Russia during the past decade is fast deteriorating, if not now entirely destroyed and the friends among those we have considered our allies are day by day becoming fewer and fewer. I believe the mandate given the President should be withdrawn at once. Surely there must be machinery which would make this possible.

In addition I urge that a cease fire be arranged at once, the unprovoked bombing of North Vietnam be stopped. Someone must compromise and if we are seriously interested in peace we should do whatever is required to bring about negotiations toward that end. I urge that these negotiations be entered into by the parties who took part in the 1954 Geneva Conference including also representatives of the Liberation Front, called by some the Vietcong, as they are the ones against whom the attack was originally directed. These negotiations should continue until a settlement satisfactory to the Vietnamese people should be arrived at which, of course, should again include a free election under the auspices of the U.N., and not to be interfered with by the United States as in the 1954 agreement.

It is difficult for me to believe that our objective in Vietnam is that which the President claims, as I do not believe the policies of this Government have changed since El-

enhower made a speech before a Governors' conference in August 1953, when he stated:

"Now let us assume that we lost Indochina. If Indochina goes, several things will happen right away. The peninsula, the last bit of land hanging on down there, would be scarcely defensible, the tin and tungsten that we so greatly value from that area would cease coming. * * * So when the United States votes \$400 million to help that war (then France's war) we are not voting a giveaway program. We are voting for the cheapest way we can to prevent the occurrence of something that would be of a most terrible significance to the United States of America, our security, our power, and ability to get certain things we need from the richest of the Indochina territory and from southeast Asia."

Occasionally the cat is let out of the bag. It would seem the interest of the United States is considered by this Government to be the only thing to be considered, as in the Latin American countries and everywhere the Government of the United States could by fair means or foul gain control. It is a disgrace and only a return to the basic ideals upon which this country and its Government were founded, adherence to the principle that each nation has an inalienable right to decide for itself the form of government it wishes to live under to run its own affairs as free citizens, without interference from without, can restore sanity to the world.

Because of the need for the public to understand just what the war in Vietnam is all about and how self-defeating it is I suggest a speaking tour of the United States by yourself and any other Member of the Senate, to lay before them the facts, that our position as the aggressor should be made most plain to them. I believe the expense for this undertaking would gladly be borne by the existing peace, church, civil rights, and other organizations, now so greatly concerned.

The question in my mind is this: Is the Senate unable longer to act in a statesman-like manner to protect the citizens of the United States or not.

Yours very truly,

DELLA F. BROWN.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
April 17, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is an expression of dissent with the immoral and illegal war in which you have committed the United States in Vietnam, and is being written for the reason that I believe failure to dissent is to imply agreement with the presence of U.S. troops in Vietnam and the senseless bombing of North Vietnam. The time has come when no longer can informed citizens remain silent.

The propaganda emanating from the State Department and the White House is totally alien to the real facts, and affronts the practical judgment as well as the moral sense of millions of those who defended you against the attacks of your opponent during last fall's campaign and who so hopefully cast their vote for you in November on the strength of your promise to take steps to end the hatred so prevalent in this country and to diligently seek roads to peace. We did not realize that the hand you promised to stretch out to all concerned in the quest, would hold a gun.

My vote, as well as that of a large majority of those who supported you was an overwhelming repudiation of the policies voiced by your opponent, Barry Goldwater. That fact should have been crystal clear to you. Now that you are safely in the seat of authority and we see you not only adopting but recommending the Goldwater policies which you soundly condemned during your campaign, we feel that we have been betrayed.

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8175

The methods you are employing in your unjustified war in Vietnam are antiquated. They reflect only what stupid men all through history have attempted, and failed to prove, that war is the only way to solve the problems that from time to time beset mankind. The truth is, historical records prove that war has been found hopelessly inadequate to produce anything but more war; is a totally unintelligent way to attempt to solve human problems and it can never result in enduring peace.

On the other hand, our Creator gave mankind laws and provided men and women with mind and the power to reason which, when used intelligently, in conformity with His laws provides the only way the peoples of the world can live and prosper together without conflict. It cannot be that you are totally ignorant of those laws, Mr. President, which comprise Christian doctrine, among which is the Golden Rule. This rule admonishes "all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them." Or can it be that you consider yourself immune to the consequences of disobedience to this basic law, and to the commandment "Thou shalt not kill"?

Looking further into the very important, though seldom mentioned subject of universal law; whether one is concerned with matters pertaining to nature or the thoughts of man upon which their actions are predicated, the universal law "like produces like" is inexorable and always operative. The cause of crime and juvenile delinquency, the breaking down of morality, etc., with which our courts are so greatly concerned now and which are increasing at such an alarming rate, leads directly to the doors of our own Government now engaged in the greatest crime of all, ruthless and brutal war which cannot be justified by any pious utterances from the State Department or the White House.

When the news reports daily on the number of Vietcong which have been killed, and in many instances those who did the killing are given medals which only glorifies the act of murder, what effect can any thinking person possibly think it would have upon the mind of our youth? If it is quite legal for their Government to kill innocent women and children, burn their homes and rain down bombs upon them, why then is it wrong to follow the example of their Government whom they have been taught to believe is beyond reproach. So the search for the cause of crime ends right at the door of the White House and the halls of Congress. It is perfectly obvious to all who do any sane thinking that crime in this country is escalating in exact proportion to the escalation of your war in Vietnam. Ponder over that, Mr. President. There is nothing more scientific than divine law.

Today a statement allegedly made by you, reported in the news, states that no human power can force you to change your Vietnam policy. This implies stubbornness, not statesmanship, on your part, a lack of courage to face the fact that to continue your present policy is to not only lose the respect of the rest of the world and their friendship, in the end, but that you not only should but will meet with complete disaster. Does it not seem a very high price to pay for your folly?

To occupy the same position in the pages of history with Mussolini and Hitler who also believed that might made right, should not be an attractive thought to you. They also gave no thought to retribution, but it came in due time and whether you realize it or not, you may be facing the same end as a result of disobedience to divine law.

The U.S. Government made a colossal blunder when it was persuaded to interfere in the internal affairs of a nation, an act forbidden by the Charter of the United Nations, to which the United States was a signatory.

It has now developed that you are compounding that error by taking on a war against a people who are actually engaged in a civil war against great odds, in the defense of their inalienable right to a government of their own choosing not one forced upon them by alien bombs, guns, and poison gas. Strangely enough the freedom of choice is the very thing to which this Government is committed, yet it appears that freedom of choice must be approved by the United States. What nonsense.

No one can deny that the Vietnamese, both North and South, are as entitled to their culture, their language, and a system of government of their own choice as are the citizens of the United States. Who among the people against whom this cruel and unjustified war is being waged could possibly believe that the only objective of the United States is to preserve their freedom when the U.S. forces are employing every cruel and inhuman method to prevent them from having that freedom, and especially when it is always stressed that any action must be in the interest of the United States?

The presence of the U.S. Armed Forces in Vietnam is to a large percentage of the population a form of tyranny, and many millions of citizens of this country agree with them. That is why people from all walks of life are demanding that you call for an immediate cease-fire and meet with all parties concerned, most particularly with the Vietcong, against whom the war is being waged, to negotiate a settlement, one acceptable to the Vietnamese people, to be determined by a free election under the supervision of the U.N. and without the presence of U.S. troops. This election is according to the provisions of the Geneva agreement of 1954 but which was circumvented by the U.S. Government. We do not feel that the people of the United States should be called upon to give of their substance, their blood, or their tears to further the aggressive policy of this Government.

It is time to recognize the fact that the world is rapidly changing. No bombs, missiles, or biological war, which this Government is so shamelessly preparing for, can stop it. It is as real as the change of the seasons. The peoples of the world are determined to break the shackles of poverty which have bound them over the centuries. They now know the cause and do not need to be told by the Communists when they are hungry, in need of the education they have never had, or the good things of life.

It is not the ones who now have might on their side and who believe that is their security, but the downtrodden and, as the Bible tells us, the meek who will inherit the earth, and it may be sooner than you think.

I do not expect a reply to this letter, nor nor do I care to receive another copy of the questions and answers on Vietnam fiction.

Most sincerely,

D.F.B.

NORTH MIAMI, FLA.,

April 24, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to congratulate you on your great effort in protesting the senseless war in Vietnam. We want to let you know we are 100 percent behind you all the way.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. WALTER L. WISEHART.

OREGON CITY, OREG.,

March, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing this letter to you to state my opinions on the Vietnam

crisis. I don't feel that the millions of dollars and numerous lives lost each day are worth all our efforts to gain friendship with this country. This is proved by the fact that each day we are physically losing face more and more; rather than gaining it as we had hoped.

I believe that the smartest move the United States could make would be to clear out of Vietnam and to do it fast. The people of Vietnam have certainly more than proved to me that they are very ungracious toward the help we have been giving them in the past. I am wondering how much longer it is going to take our U.S. Government to realize this and act accordingly.

Thank you.

Yours,

Mr. NORMAN BASS.

SHERWOOD, OREG.,

March 30, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE, this is to inform you of my support of your position on our policies in Vietnam.

It is difficult to find a valid reason for American involvement in Asia, either historically, or from people who have traveled or lived there recently.

The oriental must shake his head in wonder at the classic American jokes about "saving face."

One of the best ways I have found to remedy a social blunder is to apologize and leave. I would like to recommend this to the U. S. Government.

Sincerely,

JAY MARTIN BAKER.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,

April 2, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been shocked and sickened by what I consider to be the reckless, irresponsible, illegal and immoral actions of President Johnson in his escalation of the war in South Vietnam. During the presidential campaign President Johnson stated explicitly that there was a fundamental difference between the bellicose, trigger-happy policies of Senator Goldwater and his own sober, diplomatic, peace-loving methods. The present policy in southeast Asia makes a travesty of Mr. Johnson's promises. So far as I can see the consequences of this policy can only be disastrous.

My wife and I wish to express our admiration for your courageous and intelligent criticism of this new and savage policy of escalation. We pledge our support to you and to men in the Senate such as GREENING, CHURCH, MCGOVERN and NELSON. We are saddened and disillusioned by the craven silence of men such as MANSFIELD, FULBRIGHT, and Stevenson.

This is our third year in Oregon. We consider an honor and a great privilege that you are the Senator from this State who has the integrity and the vision and the knowledge to criticize a policy that is cruel, immoral and ultimately self-defeating.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS R. MEEHAN.

SHERIDAN, OREG.,

March 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I started to write this to the President, but thought I might get more satisfaction from writing to you.

There is so much talk about Vietnam (and while working in our State fair I noticed there was an overwhelming interest from people of all walks of life, all ages, about Vietnam) that I feel it is time for me to voice my views.

It just doesn't make sense to think we are going to ever achieve peace in this world, as

8176

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 26, 1965

long as there is a war going on any place in the world. I don't care how small it is or how isolated it is; relatively speaking there just is no such thing as a "small war," or an "isolated war."

Vietnam surely needs help, but it should come through the U.N. and the United States should get out until their help is needed and asked for by the U.N.

Thank you for the opportunity to air my feelings. I feel I am speaking to a fair man, an intelligent man, and a Christian man. It helps to know you are on the job.

Sincerely,

MOLLY BAIL.

THE DALLAS, OREG.,
March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I thank you for your outspoken opposition to our intervention in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

RUTH STOVALL.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
March 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a clipping that says plenty. Isn't there some way that this undeclared war can be stopped? Each day we read in the papers how war is being stepped up. The French knew enough to get out of South Vietnam but apparently we haven't learned our lesson yet.

Anything that you can do to stop that war that is leading directly to war there will be greatly appreciated.

Thanks for the many favors you have done and for your stand on this South Vietnam situation. I am,

Yours truly,

MARTIN H. BAKER.

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 31, 1965]

ASIAN NOVELIST CRITICIZES U.S. VIETNAM POSITION

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY, SALEM.—U.S. action in Vietnam is promoting communism and "you should pay attention to your Senator, WAYNE MORSE, on the Vietnam issue," claimed Dr. Han Suyin in talks at Willamette University Tuesday.

Dr. Han, a doctor of medicine and successful novelist who knows many of Asia's leaders personally, criticized U.S. policy and actions in Vietnam and said, "You're not reassuring your friends; you're frightening them and consequently losing them."

Dr. Han, who lives in Malaya, backed Morse's position calling for U.S. withdrawal, a solution that she feels is necessary to achieve the ends which the United States claims to be seeking in Vietnam.

Her comments came during informal talks to students following a morning address on "The Many Faces of Asia," as part of the Willamette lecture series.

UNITED STATES SAID MISINFORMED

Dr. Han indicated that the United States is sadly misinformed on the Vietnam situation and that citizens in general are trying to take a short cut to knowledge on the basis of mass communication that still doesn't present the whole situation.

In speaking on the many faces of Asia, Dr. Han stated that the "bedrock problem of Asia today is that it did not invent the steam engine."

"While the Western World has been involved in an industrial revolution for the past 400 years, only in the last 100 years has Asia begun to emerge from the feudal age in a struggle to assume its identity in the world."

POVERTY PREVALENT

Dr. Han indicated that 80 percent of the Asian population lives in the countryside, where peasants stagnate at the level of poverty.

"But," she added, "the peasant no longer accepts the problems of poverty as God-given; he knows they are from the hand of man."

Land reform was seen as a necessity before any industrial revolution and "we cannot look forward to anything but change and turmoil for at least the next two decades."

TRADE, NOT AID

"Trade, not aid is the motto of Asia," she declared. Restrictive tariffs have hindered external markets for Asian goods and poverty hinders internal markets.

She said any form of government that offers some measure of security, some measure of prosperity to the many people who are starving, will have the people's support.

"It is good for Americans to talk of freedom and democracy, but the word freedom is unknown to the peasant—it is not even in his language. He has only the freedom to starve," she said.

There has to be an overwhelming drastic reform in Asia from the bottom up. And it's not going to be attained by means of arms or might, according to Dr. Han.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 2, 1965.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our President's barbarism has gone too far. This time he really flipped his lid, burning people like Nero, and Hitler.

My conscience continues to bother me so I wrote some more letters (copies enclosed). I hope my last letters have enough poison in them to poison those war hawks, because I'm getting a bit discouraged.

I can't even imagine how you could take it all these years.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. NATALIE DRISCOLL.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 2, 1965.

The OREGONIAN,
Editor HERBERT LUNDY,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR EDITOR: Do you really believe that you can stop our President's barbarity with your editorials?

Nero was a happy and gay person; he was happiest most of all when he set his city, Rome, on fire. As you know, he played his musical instrument while people burned. Sure, he was crazy.

Strange how history repeats itself. Is our President sane when he sets forests on fire, deliberately burning alive babies, children, and illiterate, poverty-stricken villagers. He is happy on TV (see enclosed letter to Vice President HUMPHREY).

Don't say stop, stop President for this he will not do (you can already see this). Instead try to figure a way to yank this pyromaniac out of the Presidency or to get Congress to limit his war authority by new legislation. People should not expect this poor soul to act rationally.

Enough people on both sides have already been murdered; what are you waiting for catastrophic figures or world war III? This is no time for embarrassment, we, the public, are to blame for the President's actions, for we are sane. It should not be my country right or wrong but on the contrary, if my country is right, OK, but if wrong, correction.

Why not try (if possible) to arrange a conference between our newspapermen and TV networks for the purpose of solving the problem for it is a problem that neither you

nor the Vice President can manage alone. It's fantastic that world powers and Congress are also afraid to act but the problem is serious and everyone thinks and hopes the other fellow will do the work, and the President continues, in his madness.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. NATALIE DRISCOLL.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 1, 1965.

Vice President HUMPHREY,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICE PRESIDENT: When our side bombed Asian schools both with gas and bombs, most war hawks did not shed many or any tears. However, when the U.S. Embassy, officers club, and other headquarters groups perish, these same war people cry murder! In this day and age, how can anyone not know that war is tragic murder on both sides?

In the past, war hawks enjoyed relative immunity. During the day, they sat unscathed behind desks, far behind the battle-front planning and carrying out bloody wars, in which the sons of common people, for the most part, died in great agony in trenches or were crippled. At night, many of these same war hawks, thoughtlessly entertained themselves with speeches, festive dinners, beauties and champagne.

The war in Vietnam is unique in that the Communists are no respecters of this ancient tradition and now, all participate, all die. Tragic murder? What about the school-children?

What about burning alive with fire, innocent South Vietnamese civilians. The United States put on fire 19,000 acres of forest, claiming that leaflets were dropped, warning civilians to get out. The President very well knows that 90 percent cannot read (in fact you could make it 100 percent for villagers). If there would be one or two who could read, would the leaflet fall in their hands, in the right place. One does not need to look for hell after death; this is hell.

Jesus, if there is a God (nature-spirit), like you said there is and you are the earthly spirit (part of the great universe power) why then do you permit this insanity on poor people, while the war hawks laugh like devils and claim their morale is lifted? "What Price Glory?"

Come to think of it, Jesus stated that before the advent of His new world system, there would be famines, earthquakes, and wars. It's unfortunate for the human race to suffer such great tortures but maybe they are necessary to produce wisdom (reason and not book knowledge) in order for the world to survive.

Famines and earthquakes force the common people to band together as groups to fight for human rights against both natural and man-made disasters and injustices.

Punishment of war hawks is mandatory for these people do not understand that the earth was created by a great universe power and should not be devastated by their stupidity or insanity. I'm sure its God's will that war hawks will be banished forever, for earth is His footstool and He isn't going to allow pipsqueak generals to make a fool out of Him.

It is for this reason that U.S. doves are crying and their numbers are becoming greater as the war escalates and gets dirtier. Four U.S. wars in half a century is sufficient proof that war does not achieve freedom and that only wisdom can produce this, particularly since both sides are unconquerable and left (Christ and his follower, Karl Marx, were both for the poor).

Since the doves are an intelligent public, how long are you going to ignore their me-

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8177

sage? If you cannot recognize your public, here is its shape:

1. Science and religious groups clamor for peace.

2. Students and teachers fast and sing such as 1, 2, 3, 4, we don't want war (in Vietnam); 5, 6, 7, 8, have the world associate.

3. Newspaper editors and writers (formulators of public opinion) are advising the President not to abdicate his responsibilities to military hawks and for Congress not to abdicate war responsibilities to one man.

4. Congressmen (even Republicans) cry for humanitarianism.

5. We, common people, demand peace with or without negotiation. How much clearer can the public get? Like Jesus said, "They have ears but do not hear."

Since we doves voted you into office (war-hawks lost Goldwater), then we, the people, demand that you serve us. If you too are not capable of carrying out your duties, why not resign and give someone else a chance to do your job better?

Recently I heard the President state, "He felt like a jackass pelted by Texas hail." It's bad enough for others to think this but if the President (in his position) feels this way, he needs help. His soul is not altogether wicked (for he did all right on the home front) but his soul is lost and groping in world affairs.

"It is your job to help this poor soul; don't be afraid. As your rank superior, the President's powers are limited. He cannot fire you because the people hired you. The people made you second in command (so quit hiding) and be an assistant to the President, not his servant. However, remember above all, that your oath demands that you remain loyal to the country, not the President.

It's true you haven't shown much support for the President's foreign policy; in fact, your intelligence makes this virtually impossible. However, this doesn't seem to be enough. Wisdom like yours should shine like a beacon and not be just barely visible through cracks in a bushel. Your own advice to the President would be of more value than all the military jackasses that there are in the United States; so why is it necessary for the President to go to the jackasses or feel like one?

When the President saluted the space twins it seemed to me as if he were trying to recapture some kind of a military aura, perhaps the kind he missed in World War II.

If the President really means "Give me liberty or give me death" what is there to stop him from becoming a commander in chief on the battlefield like Theodore Roosevelt? The battlefield is not particular; it will accept anyone, as well as his daughters, as can be witnessed in Vietnam. I'm sure the United States wouldn't miss him, for under his policies the United States considers humans dispensable and then you (the more intelligent) could be President.

The above criticism may be a bit harsh, but it is constructive. Our President should not expect our people to do that which he, himself, or his daughters would not be willing to do. The President once remarked he would be here in the year 2000.

Also, at 57, the President should be able to accept criticism and profit through it, for that is the purpose of criticism. I now reject the idea that public officials should be shielded from criticism; this is a democracy.

However, if the President's narcissistic love of self is so strong that he cannot bear the tiny and ancient Vietcong winning, to such an extent that he will even burn alive people he's supposed to be helping in order to get at the Vietcong, then he needs a psychiatrist. In defeat, insane defiance. Under such circumstances the man apparently will plod and escalate until world war III blows up the world. You cannot expect him to act

rationally like Kennedy with Cuba. Kennedy asked the military, "How many people would be killed?"

In World War II, as an overseas WAC, I was saluting and wearing a uniform but I wasn't contributing anything of value to my country. Is this patriotism?

Now in the war against war, I have to summon the utmost courage to write letters like this. It takes real patriotism for I am a diabetic and arthritic, in continual pain and infection, and extremely tired of writing letters.

Wisdom is the greatest weapon but I feel like Jesus trying to teach people full of hate from a painful position on the cross.

In April 1961, I was near death with septicemia (blood poisoning), endocarditis, and rheumatic fever. The pain was more than I could bear and I prayed for Jesus to take me away. Soon after, in a dream, I saw my 4-year-old son, tears streaming down his face, begging me not to die.

It was then that my Jesus philosophy took shape and since then it bothers me to see little children suffer. Yet children are the greatest victims of war; imagine burning children alive for adult problems.

This is my personal appeal but since you men want cold facts, alright there are those, too.

With the advent of nuclear energy, generals are as obsolete as the horse and buggy and earth people have important things to do, such as learning how to get along. Please contemplate and comprehend if possible, genius, the following paragraph retrieved from a pamphlet.

"Space is so immense that the best human minds are unable to comprehend it. In our own galaxy there are about 100 billion stars 'like our own sun' that are stretched over such an inconceivable distance that light, moving at a speed of 186,000 miles a second, takes 100,000 years to cross it. And this is only one of an unknown number of galaxies. Light from the most distant one that man can see with his largest optical telescope took 2 billion years to reach the earth. Compared with such vastness, man's rocket accomplishments fade to insignificance."

This is sufficient reason why the doves must win. In comparison to the universe, tell our President, he isn't even an insignificant flea and blowing us the world isn't going to make him any bigger. If this doesn't give him humility, nothing will.

I am under the impression, that in the event that a Commander in Chief is not capable of discharging his duties that the Vice President takes over. I do not know what is the criteria, who will determine and when, but the world is about to be blown to bits, and there isn't any time to waste. You and those over 400 Congressmen should do something more than talk. Ask the Congressmen for help.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. NATALIE DRISCOLL.

P.S.—Do not give the President this letter. He is beyond help of my letters and they would only enrage him.

CRESWELL, OREG.,

March 29, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,

President of the United States, the White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In Eugene, as in many places in the United States, groups have used foreign policy association compiled material and other information in "Great Decisions" discussion groups. We have just had a session on Vietnam.

Because of participating in such a study group I do not presume to inform you about a situation concerning which you have plenty of knowledgeable informers. But, I do have to assume that our actions in Vietnam do

not become a good American nor a good democracy.

It seems important to me that we lead for self-determination in South Vietnam just as earnestly as we do in Alabama. And, I want this letter to convey to you the strong support I have felt, and tried to express locally, for your leadership in insuring Negro rights in our Southland. That will stand to your credit in history pages.

Contrary to this action, however, you take leadership in Vietnam to force a government upon the people that they detest so much that they run for Communist help to get away from their government and the United States. So, instead of protecting the area from communism we may be said to expand communism, and must, in following our present course, end up in history as the Nation that circumvented a democracy in Vietnam that we preached and tried to practice at home.

In view of the present situation I believe it is most vital to world peace and to our Nation's honor that we move at once, and with the greatest speed consistent with soundness, to make it possible for the South Vietnamese people to elect a government that represents them and their desires. I recognize that there are possibilities of Communist strength in the area but nonetheless that it is an area traditionally opposed to Chinese domination.

Is it not very important that we stop action considered colonial like in the area and take leadership in U.N. effort to give those people the right of free expression in their government? With the right will, a way can be found to do this. Our leadership seems to be lacking the will to give there what we insist upon for ourselves. Lacking this our help and encouragement on the Mekong River project and U.N. activities may fail to convince them that we are not aggressors.

Historically, Communists have been accused of letting the end justify the means used to gain it. Some have answered that the means becomes the end. If we are right, Mr. President, it seems we will be more prudent to exemplify less the violent means of some Communists and more the nonviolent means of some Negroes who are over-coming.

But our time is short. We tarnish our honor by being forced into democratic action for the more lasting good of all. Surely we should stop the "Little Tin God" stand we are making in southeast Asia. And, surely with the right will and cooperation with the United Nations we can give more democracy to that area even though they may make some bad choices as we no doubt have sometimes done.

Sincerely yours,

G. RALPH EARLE.

Copy to Senators: WAYNE MORSE, MAURINE NEUBERGER, and Congressman ROBERT DUNCAN.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,

March 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your courageous advocacy of peace in Vietnam. Our present policy seems directed toward the destruction of the U.N.; we seem to be striving to earn the enmity of the Indo-Chinese by destroying their villages. We confuse civil war with Chinese- and North Vietnamese-backed invasion, setting ourselves as judges over the right to self-determination of the Vietnamese people.

I believe that just as we have no right to dictate the political destiny of a people, we also have no right to dictate their economic destiny. We are our brothers' keepers, and must help them, but our help need not be

8178

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 26, 1965

given tactlessly. Aid should be so administered as to provide the greatest possible advancement at the least possible cost to the recipient's dignity.

As a Peace Corps volunteer in Chile I observed that AID money was much less effective than Rockefeller or World Bank or UNICEF money. Our foreign aid program has too many bosses—both high AID officials and visiting Congressmen. (However, very few of these take the trouble to go on inspection trips far outside Santiago.) These hurt the program by their emphasis on the writing of apparently fruitless reports and on rapidly visible results. Longer term projects under international organizations suffer much less from these problems. Further, internationally directed projects do not foster a feeling of inferiority, resentment, and dependence toward the donor—partly because he is less readily identified.

I would advocate that as much as possible of our economic foreign aid be directed through international organizations. As for military foreign aid, I fail to see why it needs to be double the economic; I should like to see it eliminated.

Sincerely,

AMOS ROOS.

THE DALLES, OREG.,
April 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm writing you a few lines to let you know I agree with you 100 percent on your views concerning the situation in Vietnam. Fully four-fifths of the people I talk to also think as we do about that senseless war. Isn't there something that we, the people, can do about it. Many of us are willing and eager to do something to stop the slaughter of both our own boys and the natives of Vietnam but we lack leadership. Please help us.

Yours truly,

MAR McCULLOUGH.

OREGON CITY, OREG.,
March 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to voice my opinion on the present Vietnam crisis. I strongly feel that we should pull our troops out of Vietnam. It seems to me that it's a waste of time leaving our boys to help out in a place where help seems unwanted. If help is wanted, it's wanted only by the minority and the United States goes against her principle "majority rules" by trying to force democracy upon people who don't want it and seem to fight it at every step.

Another point to be considered is—even if democracy finally was accepted by the Vietnamese, their government is so unstable that democracy would fail to last for any length of time.

It seems a terrible waste that the lives of our boys and the money of our country should be sacrificed for the well-being of a country that fails to appreciate it. It seems to me that there must be a better answer to this problem.

Respectfully yours,

Miss PAT LYONS.

COOS BAY, OREG.,
April 1, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: I read the speech you made at Portland, Oreg., concerning Vietnam and I wish to say that I agree with you. I hope that the United States does not go completely berserk.

I believe the people of this country have been so brainwashed about communism that they can no longer use good judgment about it.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE HAGQUIST.

YACHATS, OREG.,
April 5, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: McGeorge Bundy says he believes the American people support President Johnson's present policy in Vietnam. He was rather vague about his source for making this assessment.

I want you to know this citizen does not support our present policy in Vietnam. This citizen still agrees with you—we should not be fighting in Asia.

If, as Bundy says, President Johnson believes that Asia is for the Asians, and that the development of their resources should be undertaken by Asian leaders, is it not reasonable that the Asians should fight their own wars?

President Johnson stated something to the effect that the terrorist bombing of our embassy in Saigon will strengthen (?) the American people's resolve to fulfill our obligation (?) in South Vietnam. He sounded almost like Roosevelt after Pearl Harbor. If our security forces there had advance knowledge of such a bombing, was not the laxity in military police protection a virtual invitation for them to go ahead and bomb it?

This is not an accusation—it is a question which I think the American people should be wondering about.

The knowledge that Hanoi, with the overt backing of Peiping and now Moscow, started an aggressive action by organizing the Vietcong insurrection, is coupled with this tragic pose of Uncle Sam as the rich moral crusader who will send his eager nephews to the far side of the world to fight on any foreign battlefield, in any foreign war, where he is invited to defend a non-Communist nation.

The fact remains—lost in the uproar of a righteous cause—that the United States should not be fighting in an Asian war. We should never have undertaken that commitment when the French bowed out. We should recognize now that it was and is a mistake. Or are we too swelled in the head? In the long run continuing this war will hurt us more than it hurts Red China.

Do our generals enjoy this Vietnam thing? Let them be reminded that these men and boys who die in the mud and jungle and skies of southeast Asia are not little tin soldiers. Each one is an irreplaceable human being who deserved better than to die in a war between two nations in Asia.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE DAWSON.

BEAVERTON, OREG.,
April 3, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is written in response to your recorded speech which was broadcast on the Portland, Oreg., radio station, KEX. The speech concerned the "nausea producing, nonlethal" gas being supplied by the U.S. Government for use in Vietnam. Previous to your speech, I had felt that the use of this gas was immoral and unethical. However, your speech pointed out the fact that the use of this gas is also illegal in the terms agreed upon at the Geneva Convention.

Since I am in complete opposition to this action on the part of our Government, I am writing to you to ask what I might do in support of the feeling you so positively expressed in the above-mentioned speech. As a voter, taxpayer, and loyal citizen of the United States, I feel obligated to speak out at this time. I realize my position as part of the masses is quite insignificant in moving our Government to make decisions. Therefore, I hope that you, as my Senator, will be

able to act supporting the feelings you have expressed and to call on me requesting any help I might possibly give to aid this cause.

Very sincerely yours,

DIANA M. GERDING.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 4, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have attended your recent debate with Senator PROXMIER in Portland. As U.S. citizens and the residents of Oregon we are proud to have you as our Senator.

May we thank you for bringing the truth, no matter how ugly at times, to the American people. We trust you will continue your relentless campaign for a lawful solution in Vietnam, as well as in other parts of the troubled world.

You have our gratitude and fullhearted support for your brave actions and your outspoken views.

Sincerely yours,

AZIADNA V. LAPIN.
EUGENE LAPIN.PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 6, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a retired horse trainer, I have been following your fight to preserve the American people from a cruel and burdensome war in Vietnam.

I must reveal to you that I have nothing but the most highest respect and admiration for your actions and speeches to expose to the public the illegality of this country's involvement in a war largely imposed on the American and Vietnamese people by former Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles and his successors in office, who have failed and neglected to conduct international affairs in conformance with international law and commonsense.

As your loyal supporter, I commend you in opposing this administration's policy and its further involvement to escalate the war in Vietnam. Nearly every person of experience can foresee that before this war is resolved, President Johnson and his advisers, as well as the American people, will have an adequate opportunity to sober up with the absolute knowledge of the fact that the United States cannot forcefully rule and dominate the yellow race without extending the casualty lists into the millions.

Retreat may seem cowardly but at times most wise; realistic negotiation, most likely, may lead to an honorable solution. If the President were to appoint you to serve in a capacity to explore and to participate in negotiations with the North Vietnamese and other governments in a United Nations forum, you could help the United States find a peaceful solution to terminate the war. Your experience in solving labor disputes would enable you to bargain effectively in behalf of the United States and the people of the world.

You may use this letter as you may see fit.

Sincerely,

GLEN KLINE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 4, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Keep talking, for you are right and we are thankful that you are being understood and we all hear you.

I have been very disappointed since the election that our program is not as peaceful as it was presented.

I would almost think the other party had won if I hadn't seen the victory.

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8179

I think the President had too many Republican advisers, and they promised the Democrats waged the wars.

They must be very happy that they are not losing face, when losing face seems to be the big problem in the war program for the Nation. The Republicans will say we told you so for they are now saying the Democrats followed their program.

Respectfully yours,

CRYSTAL MAXWELL.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please count me among those urging a peaceful settlement in Vietnam soon.

Sincerely yours,

SYBIL EMERSON.

McMINNVILLE, OREG.

APRIL 6, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand on Vietnam is intelligent and courageous. You deserve the thanks of the whole country.

Very truly yours,

MILLICENT A. ST. HELEN.

SALEM, OREG.

FOSTER, OREG.,

April 7, 1965.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As you have been consistently right on issues and questions concerning Asia, you are doubtless so on Vietnam.

We should get out of there whether we save or lose face. It seems to me that President Johnson and his chief advisers are sold on the idea that might is right. I wonder if they have considered the nations that have survived the practice of this policy? Most of my neighbors say they feel the same way.

HERBERT T. HUGHES.

SALEM, OREG.,

April 6, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily agree with your stand on Vietnam. Your debate in the ER center April 2 was very enlightening and it seems that the public is being told only what the administration believes the public should know.

We have the undying hatred of the masses in Asia from our conduct of the war.

Respectfully,

VICTOR A. HELGESSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

April 7, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to express my protest concerning our present policies and actions in Vietnam.

We must invest our resources and our prestige in the direction of the rational, intelligent and civilized method of resolution of conflict as provided for by the United Nations. The nonuse of this course of action is irresponsible for a country in a position of leadership.

We must not follow the course of action of even "limited war." In an era of great scientific achievement and growth of all knowledge such as never before dreamed of, it is unbelievable that we resort to fighting and killing in a manner distinguishable from the behavior of animals only by the weapons.

Our present actions in Vietnam are not only morally wrong, but legally and rationally wrong as well. To resolve, or attempt to resolve, differences and competitions between communism and ourselves through anything

resembling war is a betrayal of everything we stand for.

This is the time to stand for a world order, a system, a process to resolve differences and achieve compromise, and if there were none our country should strive to create such an organization. Of all things, we must not turn our backs on the United Nations and fail to use it. If we see weaknesses, work to correct them rather than revert to savagery.

Sincerely,

ROSS C. MILLER.

(Copies to Senator WAYNE MORSE and Representative EDITH GREEN.)

PORTLAND, OREG.,

April 9, 1965.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a few lines to tell you I am very glad for the stand you have taken on our involvement in southeast Asia. As I see it this is the result of our interest in other people's affairs. I was learned at an early age to mind my own affairs and I have been very glad for that learning; it has paid off wonderfully for me and I am sure the same principle applies to nations as well. Please take a look at the record, I am sure you can see what price England, France, Spain, and Germany paid for their "interest" in outlying countries. Then glance at the record of those countries who have tended their own affairs and see where they stand.

We have spent millions to develop the United Nations and now refuse to put our disagreements before that wonderful body of nations. Even the most ignorant uneducated peoples can see we are on the wrong road if we want a fair and just peace.

Please continue your opposition to all entanglements whether it be in Asia or any other oversea country where we would only be ridiculed for becoming involved. As I am sure you know we have millions of hungry people right here in our good old U.S.A. The bread and soup line is getting longer and longer, even some women in it now right here in Portland, Oreg., so do all you can to stop spending any more money overseas.

No matter who started that mess, over there, Johnson could have pulled out with clean hands since we all know he did not start it but he failed to do that and has now got himself in clear over his head so will be blamed for all of it. Let's let the world know there are a lot of people here that talk peace and mean it.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK H. ANDERSON.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,

Holden, Mass., April 8, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While, as a Democrat and a resident of the State of Oregon, I do not always agree with your political stance, I am writing today to express my appreciation to you for your courageous and reasoned stand relative to the "war" in Vietnam. It seems to me that the United States clearly is in the wrong in pursuing its policy there.

I am a candidate for the ministry and a student at Andover Newton Theological School. While I will be unable to join a march on Washington on April 17 to urge the Congress and the President to press for immediate negotiation and cease-fire in Vietnam, my sympathies are certainly with the march and with your position.

I urge you not to be pressured by those favoring our present position, including the minority leader. You have a good many supporters in the colleges and seminaries of Boston.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. CRUCER.

Senator MORSE: Points you may wish to make relevant to the Rusk speech to Society of International Law, and otherwise:

1. We are embarked on the road to becoming the world's most hated people.

2. This is because we have finally managed to combine pious righteousness with power. Heretofore we have been morally sure of ourselves, but never sure of our power. Now we are sure of ourselves.

One is reminded on the exchange: "Only fools are positive." "Are you sure?" "I'm positive."

3. Secretary Rusk sought in his international law speech to compare the present aggression in Vietnam, with the Hitler aggression. This carries historical analogy to the point of absurdity:

(a) Communist China is not Hitler Germany.

(b) Most of the world perceived the danger of Hitler; only the United States perceives the danger of China.

(c) Germany was a great industrial power; China is not.

(d) Germany threatened the sources of Western Civilization; Communist China does not.

(e) And furthermore, we're not fighting China.

(f) We didn't belong to the League of Nations; we do belong to the United Nations.

4. Someone has lost his perspective; either the President and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, or the American people, a majority of the Members of the Senate, and most of the nations of the world.

5. I shudder what would be happening now if Mr. Goldwater had been elected President and embarked on this course of action. He would be torn to pieces by the Senate.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT DUKE UNIVERSITY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on April 24 the Vice President of the United States delivered an address before a gathering at Duke University, in Durham, N.C. The remarks of the Vice President on that occasion deserve the thoughtful consideration of all Americans. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that the speech of the Vice President at that time be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DUKE UNIVERSITY, APRIL 24, 1965

My fellow students, my theme today is this: "What Can We Americans Ask of Each Other in 1965?"

Where are we bound in life?

What is our place in the world?

It was only 30 years ago that millions of Americans asked of each other: "Brother, can you spare a dime?"

Our great friend Carl Sandburg tells about those times:

"The man in the street * * * lives now Just around the corner from you

Trying to sell the only thing he has to sell,
The power of his hand and brain
To labor for wages, for pay, for cash of the realm.

And there are no takers, he cannot connect."

No, my fellow students—and we are all students in this world, for the learning process never stops—no, there were no takers then, and there were millions of us who could not connect.

I saw all of it as a young man—a young man the age of most of you in this audience.

I saw my neighbors and people in South Dakota losing their farms, their businesses, their health, their hope.

All we had was dust and desperation. We didn't worry much then about "have you gone Cunard in the off-season?" "Why is the Fastback the most exciting news in America?" "Have you cleaned with a White Tornado?"

No. We worried then about shelter, clothing and holding onto work and life. Thank God those times are past.

But to my generation they will always be fresh and real. And a reminder that our precious democratic society once tottered on the edge.

This Nation 30 years ago was divided, deeply divided: Have and have-not, business and labor, North and South, black and white, farm and city, left and right. But in face of disaster and revolution we united—united, I might add, under brilliant leadership—to face our common foes. First, economic crisis at home. Then, totalitarianism and barbarism abroad.

We did not have to be asked what we could do for each other and for our country. We had to fight for survival.

Most of you here today were born after those crises had passed. You have lived in time of prosperity. You have not known what my generation knew.

But your young generation has not turned inward on itself or satisfied itself with material pleasures.

You have responded to the needs of these times and you have done it in magnificent fashion.

You are the volunteer generation.

There are now 10,000 volunteers serving in the Peace Corps with more than 3,000 already returned and another 100,000 waiting for their chance to participate.

When VISTA—the Volunteers in Service to America—was launched, there were 3,000 inquiries on its first day of business.

And I know that in most of the minds here today there is the question: What can I do to serve my country and my fellow man?

President Lyndon Johnson held his first Presidential appointment at 27 and his first political office at 29. As he has said:

"No one knows more than I the fires that burn in the hearts of young men who yearn for the chance to do better what they see their elders not doing well . . . or not doing at all."

Old men dream dreams, but young men see visions.

Today in our country there is a vision of a Great Society.

The nature of this vision has much to do with my question here today: What can we Americans ask of each other in 1965?

In this time of prosperity, is the Great Society to be a welfare state? Some may think so. But that is not the vision of President Johnson. Neither is it my vision.

We see the Great Society as a state of opportunity.

No government owes every man a living. But a just government of, by and for the people does owe every man an opportunity to enjoy the blessings of life.

The Great Society is based on the proposition that every man shall have that opportunity.

If you examine the legislative program in this Congress; if you listen to the words of our President; if you look into your own heart you cannot escape the conclusion that we are succeeding, we are breaking through in our efforts to provide all American men and women with that precious opportunity.

Some, once receiving it, may squander it. But all Americans must have the chance—a chance now denied to many—to make something better of their lives and the lives of their children.

Only a few days ago this Congress passed a great bill which is a basic investment toward achieving that equality of opportunity: the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Thomas Jefferson was right. We cannot be both ignorant and free.

This act in itself is accomplishment enough to satisfy an ordinary Congress. But it will be followed soon by passage of the higher education bill.

These bills together will help build classrooms. They will provide funds for libraries and textbooks and teaching materials. They will provide funds for research in teaching techniques and development of community education centers.

They will above all, I hope, give new inspiration to teacher and student alike in the exhilarating experience of gaining and using knowledge. (And may I digress for a moment to say that true education depends more than anything else on the quality of teaching. I may be venturing here into dangerous ground, but I must say that there must thus be an appropriate balance between research and teaching.)

The education bills passed by this Congress will contribute to the long-term, lasting health of this Nation. So will a dozen other bills which will come from this Congress, acting out the will of the American people.

For the American people, in unprecedented peacetime consensus and unity, have made known their purposes.

We today stand united as Americans in agreement:

That all Americans shall have truly equal education.

That all Americans shall have truly equal voting rights.

That we shall provide adequate medical care to our people.

That we shall make our cities better places in which to live and work in safety and health.

That we shall preserve this Nation's beauty, history, and natural resources.

That we shall open our doors again to immigrants who can enrich and lend new vitality to our national life.

That we shall help our urban and rural Americans alike adjust to technological revolution and social change.

That we shall not drop the torch of international leadership.

For there are voices in America today which say that America is overextended in the world; that other people's problems needn't be our problems; that we ought to close up shop overseas and enjoy our fruits here in the good old U.S.A.

When that time comes, this Nation is doomed.

Who in the world will work for democracy if we do not?

Who in the world can preserve the peace if we do not?

Who in the world can set the example, can offer the needed hand, if we do not?

We live in a time when everything is complex, when there are no more rapid and easy answers. We live in a time when we must exert our patience as never before.

Let me spell it out: Have we the patience, for instance, to work, sacrifice, and bleed 5,000 miles from home—in Vietnam—for months and perhaps years ahead without guarantee of final success? I can tell you that the forces of totalitarianism have that patience.

For the forces of totalitarianism do not plan to blow the world to pieces. They plan to pick it up piece by piece as we progressively tire and withdraw.

But, as President Johnson declared in his historic speech at Johns Hopkins University:

"We will not be defeated.

"We will not grow tired.

"We will not withdraw."

We will not sacrifice small nations in the false hope of saving ourselves. We will defend the cause of freedom wherever it may be threatened.

But at the same time, with equal determination, we will pursue each possibility of lasting and just peace. The pursuit of peace resembles the building of a great cathedral. It is the work of generations. In concept it requires a master architect; in execution, the labors of many. It requires patience.

Thus I call on you as the generation coming to leadership to be strong and persevering: strong in defense of justice and in opposition to tyranny—persevering in seeking a goal of peace for all men.

I return then once more to my question: What can we Americans ask of each other in 1965?

I am essentially a religious person. I am not ashamed of it. I believe that God created man in His own image. I believe that there is a spark of the divine in every person. And I believe in the meaning of human dignity.

My fellow students, the big struggle in the world—and at home—today is not over the forms of production. Those shift and change. The struggle is about men's relationship to man and man's relationship to a higher and nobler force.

I say that what we can ask of each other is this:

To fight poverty because poverty destroys the human spirit and human dignity.

To fight discrimination because it violates the precepts of our democratic society and Judeo-Christian ethic.

To pursue justice because it is basic to our religious and ethical heritage.

To pursue an honorable peace because it is the greatest gift we can give to our children.

So that there can be no question that man—and not the state—is the most important thing worth preserving in this world.

We can do it. It is within our grasp—perhaps for the first time in history.

Yes, the first step toward these things is the longest journey. And we have made that step. And the second step. And now we take a third.

We are privileged each year, each decade, each generation in our time to take a new step.

How fortunate we are to live in this dramatic and creative period of change, of challenge, of opportunity. How great is our responsibility to achieve excellence of mind and spirit to do the tasks that must be done.

I appeal, therefore, to you the generation of 1965:

Make no little plans.

Have no little dreams.

Do not set your standards and goals by those of your mother and father.

Do not set your standards and goals by those of this time.

Challenge the impossible. Do what cannot be done.

Thirty years ago it was "Brother, can you spare a dime?"

Today we reach the stars.

My friends, I ask of you: Believe in the perfection of man; make a better life for our people; save the peace; build a Great Society to last for generations beyond us.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, relevant to our consideration of pending legislation to benefit the arts and humanities in the United States is the fact that the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution is included on the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities proposed in S. 1483, the administration bill which I had

Mr. DOUGLAS. But Mr. Addicks was aided by the Republicans, and the Senators' specific example was aimed against the city of Chicago and was not an example which supports his case.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an intriguing editorial from the April 23, 1965, issue of the Government Standard, signed by John F. Griner, national president of the American Federation of Government Employees.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Government Standard, Apr. 23, 1965]

HEARING DELAY UNFAIR TO IRS EMPLOYEES

The Internal Revenue Service's handling of cases involving serious charges against some of its employees should be a matter of grave concern to all Federal employees and to all citizens who believe in justice and fairplay. Internal Revenue has played fast and loose with the rights of these employees and has subjected them to unwarranted indignities.

All of this, presumably, has been done in the interest of preserving the integrity of the Agency and our tax collecting system. But integrity can no more be preserved by fear and pressure tactics than democracy can be protected by adopting the repressive measures of totalitarian states. The Internal Revenue Service has behaved as it it never heard of some of the most cherished principles on which this Nation is based, principles which go to the very heart of protection of, and respect for, individual rights and due process of law.

Internal Revenue's handling of the charges against some of its employees in New York has given new force and meaning to the old saying that "justice delayed is justice denied." A number of Internal Revenue employees in New York have been dismissed for allegedly accepting bribes or failing to report bribe offers.

Many of the dismissals were based on the testimony of a so-called tax practitioner, an individual who advises people on tax matters and helps them fill out their tax returns. This tax practitioner has admitted bribing Internal Revenue employees.

Ironically, the employees fingered by this confessed briber have been fired while he is still permitted to carry a Treasury Department card authorizing him to represent taxpayers. The employees were dismissed before they had exhausted all their administrative appeal rights within the Government.

This, unfortunately, is normal procedure in the Government service. In itself, this is bad enough, but Internal Revenue has seen fit to compound the inequity. Some of the accused employees have pleaded with Internal Revenue to hold an appeal hearing on their discharge. The agency has steadfastly refused to do this.

Internal Revenue has told the employees that the hearings they are presumably entitled to are being delayed, at the request of the Justice Department, until criminal charges growing out of the bribery accusations have been disposed of. And the Justice Department, for its part, appears to be in no hurry at all to proceed with the criminal cases.

We can find no legal justification for Internal Revenue's action in denying its employees the hearings they are entitled to under the Veterans Preference Act and the

appropriate civil service laws and regulations. The agency's only defense is the reply that such action is customary in "these cases." Meanwhile, the stigma that hovers over these employees has ruined their Government careers and, in some cases, very nearly wrecked their lives.

The alleged briberies have received wide newspaper publicity. The employees involved have found it difficult to get other jobs and have been hampered in their efforts to collect unemployment compensation. Yet the fact remains that these employees have appeals pending before the agency and have never been tried, much less convicted, on any criminal charges.

And all of this stems from accusations made by a confessed briber, a man whose credibility, to say the least, is questionable.

The IRS's handling—or mishandling—of this situation is in keeping with the agency's entire investigative procedure when it comes to its own employees. Some of the accused employees in New York have obtained other employment outside the Government only to find that Internal Revenue investigators have visited their new places of work, asked to see the employee, and then discussed the case and the nature of the charges against the employee with his new employer.

The powers of the IRS's investigative officers are truly awesome. They have the authority to make arrests and seize property without warrants if they have reasonable grounds to suspect that the person being arrested has committed a felony. Certainly such wide ranging powers should be used with discretion and judgment.

Unfortunately, this is not the case in Internal Revenue. Employees are summoned before investigators and interrogated without being told what, if any, are the charges or accusations against them. During these interrogations employees are not permitted to be represented, either by their union or by counsel. Yet these star chamber proceedings can and have led to an employee's dismissal and even to criminal charges being placed against him.

AFGE never has and never will condone wrongdoing by any Federal employee. But neither can we condone a situation which amounts to employees being adjudged guilty until proven innocent. And that has been the effect of the Internal Revenue's handling of the charges against its employees.

These employees want, are entitled to, and should have a timely hearing on the charges against them. If found guilty, they should be punished; if found innocent, they should be reinstated. There is no justification whatsoever for the Internal Revenue's action in refusing to grant these employees a chance to clear their names.

The denial of this basic right is an affront to all Federal employees and a disgrace to the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Government. It should be countenanced no longer.

JOHN F. GRINER,
National President, AFGE.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, although the whole editorial raises interesting questions about IRS practices and procedures, I was particularly interested in the paragraph relating to the issuance of the so-called Treasury cards.

According to Mr. Griner, a number of IRS employees in New York have been dismissed on the word of a tax practitioner who is an admitted briber of IRS employees. Yet this tax practitioner is still permitted to carry his Treasury card and to represent taxpayers.

On May 12, 1965, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure

is having a hearing on S. 1758, a bill which would abolish Treasury cards. Officials of the Department of the Treasury have asked to be heard on that day; and I expect to examine them closely on the identity of the accuser and why he is permitted to keep his card and to continue to represent taxpayers before the Treasury Department.

THE ADEQUACY OF PRODUCTION SCHEDULES FOR MILITARY AIRCRAFT AND HELICOPTERS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it previously has come to the attention of members of the Armed Services Committee that there is some question as to whether our current production schedules for military aircraft and helicopters are adequate to meet the attrition rate which we now are experiencing in Vietnam.

The increasing loss of planes either shot down or damaged has raised the distinct possibility that supplemental funds may be necessary to speed production of such aircraft—both those now being built, and new models shortly to be in production.

The distinguished acting chairman of the Armed Services Committee has pointed this danger out to the Senate and has indicated that his Preparedness Subcommittee will be looking into the situation. I know that it will bring to the Senate an important judgment about this matter.

I noted that Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times, discussed the attrition worry in detail in Saturday's editions of that paper, pointing out that transfers of planes from existing units already is underway. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Baldwin's revealing article be printed at this point in the Record, and I sincerely hope that other Senators will give it careful study.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1965]

VIETNAM PROBLEM: A PLANE SHORTAGE—
LIMITED SUPPLIES A WORRY AS LOSSES RISE—
U.S. CRAFT ALSO HAVE DEFICIENCIES

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The limited numbers of aircraft available and the technical shortcomings or unsuitability of the U.S. planes used in Vietnam are causing increasing worry among military officers.

Several manufacturers—Douglas, Northrup, and others—have received indications that they may be called upon to initiate or to speed up production of some military types.

Aircraft losses are slowly increasing in Vietnam as air operations are intensified, it is pointed out. Limited numbers of replacements are available for the newest and most modern types. Production lines are small for a few types, nonexistent for others.

To replace the losses, 2 squadrons of B-57 light bombers, totaling 24 planes, have been transferred from Air National Guard units to the Air Force.

TRANSPORT SERVICE AIDED

The Air National Guard has also been called upon to supplement the Military Air Transport Service to a greater degree than normally. Forty-six additional overseas

April 26, 1965

transport flights were flown by Air National Guard planes in March alone.

Helicopters and light aircraft have been transferred from U.S. forces in Europe and this country to Vietnam to provide replacements and to increase helicopter strength there.

A screening of skilled mechanics and other aircraft maintenance personnel has been underway for some time to provide for the increasing needs in Vietnam.

The military believe that some major decisions in budgeting, production, and other areas will have to be taken soon if future shortages in Vietnam are to be avoided and if inadequacies are to be remedied.

They believe that Vietnam is a kind of proving ground for fiscal and military policies and technological concepts and that some of these are being shown to be in error or inadequate or unsuitable.

Present problems stem primarily from the following factors:

The unprogramed nature of the Vietnamese war. The extraordinary expenses and expenditures incurred by U.S. forces in Vietnam have not been budgeted. Supplies, money, and equipment have come from other commands, or as military puts it, out of "other people's hides."

The pronounced reduction in military aircraft inventories and in numbers of planes produced in the United States in the last 10 years. The aircraft inventory of the Air Force and Navy was reduced by more than 4,000 planes in a decade. In 1954, 8,089 military aircraft were produced in the country. The estimate for 1964 is about 1,500.

The failure to develop an aircraft specifically designed for close ground support and for interdiction missions of the type now being flown in Vietnam.

NUCLEAR-WAR CONCEPT CITED

The reduction in aircraft totals has been caused by two policies.

One was the concept that any war the United States fought would be a nuclear conflict and that far fewer planes would be needed to deliver nuclear weapons than conventional bombs. This concept was modified in the closing years of the Eisenhower administration, and funds for conventional warfare have been sharply increased during the tenure of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

But the greatly increased costs of modern aircraft—\$4 million, for instance, for a single modern Navy A-6, a Grumman jet-powered, all-weather attack plane, as compared to about \$285,000 for an old A-1, a Douglas propeller-driven Skyraider—have prohibited the replacement of older planes on anything like a one-for-one basis.

Moreover, some thought, the increased capabilities of the new planes in speed, altitude, automation and firepower would more than compensate for the reduction in numbers.

But Vietnam appears to be upholding the contention of those who disagree with this theory, pointing out that one plane can be in only one place at any one time, that its bombardment in conventional weapons is limited and that for a conventional war greater numbers of rockets, bombs, and aircraft are required than the military budget has provided for.

BOMBING ACCURACY SCORED

The April 12 issue of Aviation Week notes that there are serious discussions in Washington "about the shortcomings of U.S. aircraft in the Vietnamese war and what means there are to correct them."

"Some Defense Department leaders contend current fighter-bombers are too fast and sophisticated for the job there and are taking fresh looks at proposals for subsonic aircraft equipped with old-fashioned guns and cannon," the magazine adds.

It describes Mr. McNamara as dissatisfied with the bombing accuracy in Vietnam and says he "is expected to show new interest in such aircraft."

The development of planes suitable for the Vietnamese type of warfare has been handicapped by a variety of factors—technological differences as to the desirable characteristics of the aircraft, different tactical concepts, service differences about the proper methods for employing airpower in support roles, and Mr. McNamara's cost-effectiveness emphasis, which has tended to emphasize "all-purpose" planes instead of specialized ones.

Some critics contend that it makes no sense to risk multi-million-dollar jet fighters, with electronic systems and missiles, against hundred-thousand-dollar bridges.

Others point out that the kind of plane required for the interdiction of roads and communications must be rugged, capable of withstanding damage from ground fire.

They say it should be able to undertake both day and night missions. The pilot compartment, at least, should be armored, they add, and the plane should be capable of flying for long periods at relatively low altitudes above roads and communications points.

In addition, it is noted, the plane should be equipped for a large and variable armaments load. No jet-powered aircraft appears to meet these requirements fully.

In an article in the April U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Lieut. Comdr. A. D. McFall says that the propeller-driven Douglas A-1, now used in limited numbers in Vietnam by the South Vietnamese and U.S. forces, has met the requirements better, than any other plane.

DECLARATION OF VIETNAM AS A COMBAT ZONE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the President for his action of Saturday in declaring Vietnam a combat zone. This action makes income tax benefits available to our men there and serves to point out an obvious fact which has previously been ignored.

Vietnam is indeed a combat zone. It has been for some time.

The President's action accomplishes the purposes sought in this Chamber last January by the introduction of a bill to declare Vietnam a combat zone. I was pleased to welcome as cosponsors on that bill (S. 459) Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, CLARK, FANNIN, FONG, JORDAN of Idaho, MURPHY, RANDOLPH, and SIMPSON.

I am sure that these cosponsors would agree with me today that nothing could give them more satisfaction than now being able to note that the bill is no longer necessary. Its goal has been accomplished and rightfully so.

It is now my hope that having given public notice that we regard Vietnam as a combat zone, this Government will promptly proceed to extend to our men there the other benefits this Nation normally has provided to fighting men.

I, for one, shall do all that I can to make certain that a Vietnam GI bill is enacted granting education and loan benefits similar to those granted by the Korean GI bill.

I am pleased to note that a Vietnam GI bill was introduced in the Senate in January by myself and Senators ALLOTT, BARTLETT, CURTIS, FANNIN, FONG, MUNDT, MURPHY, RANDOLPH, and SIMPSON. I hope that it will be enacted as a part of the coming higher education bill.

Mr. President, members of all the armed services, both officer and enlisted, have told me and written to me that they regard their service in Vietnam to be under combat conditions equal to those of Korea and World War II.

As every Senator knows, some 33,000 U.S. personnel are committed to the Vietnam war. Nearly 500 of these have been killed. We are losing boys and equipment there almost every day in this fight against communism.

America's Armed Forces have suffered more battle casualties in the war against Communist guerrillas in Vietnam than they did in the war with Spain in 1898, according to official figures. The Spanish-American War, which began 67 years ago this month, is listed officially as one of the eight principal wars in which the United States has participated.

In the undeclared hostilities in Vietnam, not on the official list, the U.S. toll to date is 2,344 killed and wounded by enemy action and a further figure of 36 captured or missing. The comparable statistics for the war with Spain, fought in Cuba and the Philippines in April-August, 1898, are 2,047 killed and wounded in battle.

Americans fighting in Southeast Asia today, and those who risked their lives in earlier years, are entitled to be regarded as combat veterans for income tax purposes and for education benefits.

The period 1954 to 1959 was a quiet period in Southeast Asia with the United States conducting a low-key military program of some 700 advisers. Communist terror and subversion were at a low level. Then, in 1960, the North Vietnamese Communists initiated a turning point with their decision to take over full direction of efforts to seize South Vietnam.

The American buildup in response to obvious Communist designs began in 1961 when we increased the number of advisers to some 2,000 in the face of Red infiltration. By 1962, we were up to 11,000 men; by 1963, to 15,500, by 1964, to 23,000; and today, to nearly 28,000.

DENIAL OF USE OF MIGRANT FARM LABOR IN TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I note that once again, today, the Secretary of Labor has forgotten Texas.

Earlier this month he admitted that his past position on the admission of bracero farmworkers was grievously in error. On April 9 he reversed his ban—which was causing a danger of rotted crops and higher consumer prices—and allowed thousands of West Indian workers to enter the country, as they normally have in the past, to assist in the citrus harvest in Florida.

I was pleased that he took care of Florida's problem, but amazed that he had ignored the same problem in my State and in California.

Now today, I see that California has been admitted to the Labor Department's union and that 1,500 Mexican bracero workers have been admitted to work the asparagus and strawberry har-

votes by sowing money in every possible field, to build power by promising solutions to all problems. But that process of Government aggrandizement cannot go unaccompanied by some weakening of individual will. It is necessary only to note how placidly many Americans today accept Federal intrusions that would have been unthinkable a generation or two ago.

Federal largess, moreover, is by no means the sole agent of the alteration, even at a time when the subsidies are proliferating at a remarkable rate. There is also a pervasive pseudo-philosophy preached both in and out of Government, a creed of irresponsibility.

In this dark dogma security becomes the paramount value, overriding thrift, prudence, self-reliance, self-respect, intelligent accommodation to the complexities of existence and often indeed simple morality and honesty. People are not merely to be helped when in need; they are to be supported no matter what they do or do not do.

It could hardly be more symptomatic of the attitude that in our era serious discussion is granted to the proposition that income should be divorced from work, which means everyone should have a guaranteed and comfortable income regardless of whether he chooses to work. That, if anything could be, is a headlong flight from adult responsibility and straight into the arms of the all-mothering State.

To look askance at the trend is not necessarily to bewail an impending despotism, at least in the usual sense. As Tocqueville also perceived, the dangers confronting democracies are more subtle. In a degenerated democracy, the central authority is not wholly exploitative but wishes the people to be happy, so long as they don't think, and it actually tries to supply their wants and necessities.

To function at all the "tutelary power" must nonetheless cover the surface of society with a network of small, complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the more original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate, to rise above the crowd.

Thus, in Tocqueville's view of the danger, "the will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent and guided. * * * Such a power does not destroy but, * * * it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the Government is the shepherd."

How near or far the American democracy is today from that denouement, and what could realistically be done to prevent its materializing—these are questions without answers. What is clear is that we have already moved some considerable distance toward that society of sheep and that the pressure of much public policy and preaching seeks to push us further toward it.

Apart from diminishing the dignity of man, one of the unhappy aspects of the flight from responsibility is that it is a delusion. In our world no one and nothing can guarantee security or wash away all sorrows and difficulties. Time and again, the Federal Government has proved its incompetence to solve the myriad problems it takes on.

But no matter what a government attempts, it cannot forever shelter a people from the abrasive realities of personal, economic, and moral imperatives. To the extent a State succeeds in keeping a citizenry in perpetual childhood, it can only assure them a more painful awakening to manhood.

Dereliction in Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, individual editorial writers around the Nation are beginning to realize and to speak out publicly about the lack of discussion in this House on some of the most important and complicated issues before us. Unfortunately, it comes too late at this time but perhaps the fact that individual voices are being raised will help convince some that fair and full discussion is far preferable to steamroller tactics.

The thing which is most puzzling to me is that in view of the huge and workable majorities which the Democratic Party has in this and the other body, that they are compelled by some force to prevent scholarship and full and fair discussion. One wonders why, in view of their large numbers, they cannot allow the minority time and other opportunities to try to explore complicated legislation, the results of which many of us do not know. Generosity on the part of the majority would seem to be politically wise as well as legislatively sound. Their unwillingness to play fair is both disappointing and not able to be understood. Hopefully columnists, editorial writers, commentators and scholars of the legislative process will do some interviews in the weeks and months ahead to find out why the majority party Members feel so insecure that they have to rush their legislation through without adequate discussion and debate. This is one concrete recommendation that I have to make today in view of what has been happening here during recent weeks and what we are told will happen in the weeks and months ahead.

Following is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 6, 1965, which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues:

DERELICTION IN DEBATE

It's tempting merely to chuckle about partisan politics when Republicans complain, as one of them did other day, that "the Great Society has turned into the great steamroller." But when a northern liberal Democrat supports the substance of that complaint, perhaps it's time to listen.

To wit, Representative EDITH GREEN's searing commentary on both the administration's primary education bill and the tactics used to speed House approval of that measure. The lady from Oregon noted that while her fellow Democrats brag of guarding minority rights, their benevolence evidently doesn't extend to congressional minorities which question official infallibility. She observed, "It seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement."

The debate did seem curiously restricted for a proposal with such far-reaching implications. Also, the bill is such a Rube Goldberg contraption that, as Mrs. GREEN said, more debate was needed simply "to let the

House know what is actually in the bill." The measure is so confusing that at one point even its sponsors couldn't agree on what its language allowed. Still, its backers seemed intent on passing it without change, and treated most amendments peremptorily, without record votes and often without discussion.

Such arrogance might be understandable if the amendments were merely political or trifling. Instead, many of them dealt conscientiously with the bill's fundamentals, such as the fact that while its ostensible purpose is helping the disadvantaged, its systems of allocating Federal funds heavily favors already wealthy States.

The majority even brushed aside bipartisan attempts to facilitate judicial tests of the bill's constitutionality. The proposal intentionally walks close to the constitutional line on church-state questions, and Federal courts often evade jurisdiction on this issue by finding that no one is directly enough affected to bring suit. One proposed amendment might have helped simply by encouraging judicial review; another definitely specified who would be eligible to start constitutional tests.

Since the bill fosters a multiplicity of approaches to aiding children in church schools, it has endless opportunity for chaos unless the constitutional questions are resolved quickly. Not surprisingly, the judicial review provision was backed by the National School Board Association, which represent boards covering 95 percent of the Nation's pupils. The House majority chose to avoid the whole constitutional issue.

Simple by closing its ears to serious questions, the Democratic majority achieved the victory of having its measure passed practically untouched. This bit of vanity means, among other things, that some disadvantaged children will get shortchanged, and the Nation's school boards will have to struggle with the tough questions the House was afraid to face. As with so many past Federal programs, the price for dereliction in congressional debate will be paid by those the program purports to help.

Duties and Responsibilities of Trial Judges—Essay by Hon. Gordon W. Chambers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Honorable Gordon W. Chambers, judge of the city court, Richmond County, Ga., has written an excellent essay on the great duties and responsibilities of trial judges. I ask unanimous consent that his essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICATURE

(By Gordon W. Chambers)

"Judici Satis Poena est Quod Deum Habet Ultorem."—1 Leon, 295.

A thousand defendants are tried by an active criminal court judge in a relatively

A1946

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 26, 1965

short space of time and each of them only once, but they in turn try civilization, the law, justice, and the judge a thousand times. Prisoner and judge pass judgment on each other.

Society must be protected, and with certainty, for its own preservation and more thought should solidify itself in behalf of the law abiding rather than sentimentalizing in behalf of the law violator.

It would be trite to emphasize in detail the terrific responsibility of a judge issuing orders, warrants and commitments, holding hearings at chambers, to say nothing of extrajudicial conferences, trying civil issues, making rulings and adjudicating subject matters of contract or tort involving immense sums of the "root of all evil," money, and even more so on the criminal side involving "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It almost staggers the imagination, one defendant's emotional life and social history with its ramification of heredity and environment, status, health, economics, character, and personality, all indicative of the record of the cause. The effect is being tried. Yet, we all know the victimized individual's right and the public interest must also be protected by the exercise of a certain and equal justice tailored to history, status, record, and offense; just as we know in spite of our sympathies a mad dog must be destroyed, a contagion must be quarantined and that we must give some of our property (taxes) to preserve the rest of it and withal continue to civilized order of government and society. Multiply this a thousand times and you have some idea of a year in the life of a jurist.

A judge doesn't forget what he knew as a man. His conscience is not concerned with its own approval or persuaded by its disapproval of a statute. He applies the law, construes and interprets, in all cases to the end that in truth justice will ensue in accordance with legislative intent. The jury establishes the facts under rules of evidence enacted in search of the truth and to make sure as human experience can make certain that the jury's final verdict reflects the truth as they found it to be. From the filing of civil petition, warrant or indictment in criminal accusation, through demurrer, plea and answer, every ruling "His Honor" makes, every construction and interpretation, every judgment rendered or sentence pronounced places the judge on trial.

Still, these judges are more powerful than President or potentate within the limits of their court's jurisdiction geographically and the subject matter. Therefore, they should be thrice more humble and lose themselves completely in applying the power of their office to the law of the land which is the last defense of democratic institutions and the rights of society.

Treating life as it is, the great Greek lawgiver, Solon, said, "No, I have not given the people the best laws; I have given them the best laws that they will stand for." There is a practical equation measured by our own enlightened progress with civilization. Always growing apace and trying to make things better and as they should be.

Elected judges must have something more than mental attainment and judicial temperament. They have to possess political sagacity, character, and personality to capture the public imagination or interest the same as any candidate aspiring to be mayor or alderman. Necessarily they have to meet and know all classes of people making up the electorate and it is essential that they be friendly if they hope to serve these people an equal and fearless universal justice. This can be done regardless and heedless of human perversity without compromise of soul, heart, mind or conscience.

The judge being a human being, he can feel friendly toward every living creature and this includes sinners as well as saints, deni-

zens, and also, citizens of the ecclesiastical clergy. It is entirely a matter of personality and strength of character. A minister and a judge, certainly those of the Christian faith, can be friendly to sinner and saint without granting immunity to any citizen for reaping what he has sown. Hate the sin if we will, but never the sinner. Before independent courts of justice there are no such things as friends or foe. "His Honor," is very dear to a judge.

Politically there are diverse views as to electing a judge for a limited tenure or appointment by legislative, executive or other committee for a rather lengthy period or life. Much can be said pro and con, but with all its imperfections the popular vote can terminate incompetence, which is very hard to do under life tenure by impeachment. The idealistic theory of unlimited tenure has proved impractical in State governments and from time to time it is censured in the Federal system.

The duties of a judge invokes, if not imposes, a cruel responsibility touching as it does the quick of a dedicated conscience, which challenges a brave indifference to any personal effect, ambition or status. God must bless with some mystical gift those judges defiant of the political demagog or boss, deaf to the cries of the mob and immune to subtle influence or treacherous flattery such as press slanted propaganda or half truth vocally. These mystically endowed wearers of the robe can look into the mirror and see nothing there but duty. They have God as their avenger and this is enough for them. They face their responsibility without tremor or fear. Socrates and his hemlock come to mind and the cross transfixes the heart.

Taxes and College Tuition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, as one of many Members who has introduced legislation during the past 5 years to obtain tax relief for parents sending children to college, I was encouraged by an editorial in *Forbes* magazine, April 15, in behalf of tax credits for college expenses.

The article follows:

TAXES AND COLLEGE TUITION

Why not?

Who would, could sensibly oppose a reasonable program for some degree of tax credit for college tuition?

Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman all advocated various Federal programs to encourage and finance higher education. President Johnson is even more all-out in his enthusiasm for substantially stepping up our investment in learning. Every State university has been growing enormously, straining State exchequers to meet the cost of educating more eligible millions of young people.

Fortunately, most Americans agree that putting money into schooling and scholarship is the wisest, soundest type of investment. Much has been done by many governmental agencies, foundations, corporations and other private groups to provide scholarships for those with college ability but not family means.

In point of fact, those who now have it the toughest are the family breadwinners who are earning too much to qualify on a poverty

basis for scholarship aid, but too little to meet the heavy burden of their youngster's college costs. Tuition, board, lodging, books, clothes and assorted sundries for a college year are figured to average over \$2,000. If there is more than 1 child in college—and the average American family now has 2.39 children—the strain on the family income, even if it is well over \$10,000 a year before taxes, is frequently prohibitive.

A number of proposals to permit a tax credit are in the congressional hopper, some of them having been introduced for many years. It is high time the advocates got together on one measure and put it through. The postwar baby crop is now of college age and the squeeze between rising costs and larger numbers is really on and really hurting.

With a President and a Congress and a people all sympathetic to the family financial problem and all warmly committed to the value of higher education, it surely should be possible this year to enact a meaningful college tuition tax-credit measure.

UN Our Position in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "The World Now Knows Precisely How It Can Have Asian Peace," published in the *Atlanta Constitution* of April 8, 1965; also an article entitled "U.S. Concept Is All Wrong," written by Walter Lippmann and recently published. Both the editorial and the article deal generally with the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the *Atlanta Constitution*, Apr. 11, 1965]

THE WORLD NOW KNOWS PRECISELY HOW IT CAN HAVE ASIAN PEACE

President Johnson greatly enlarged the possibility of peace in Vietnam Wednesday night by spelling out what the United States will not do, and what it will do.

If the war must continue, then "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw . . . Armed hostility is futile . . . our resources are equal to any challenge . . . our patience and determination are unending . . . We will use our power with restraint . . . But we will use it."

That much needed stating once and for all, and it was so stated.

What the United States will do, if North Vietnam is ready to call off its war; and permit "an independent South Vietnam" to live as it wishes, "securely guaranteed" and "free from outside interference" by anybody, was spelled out with a clarity, in advance of any negotiations, that may be unprecedented in modern diplomacy.

The United States for its part will accept a South Vietnam "tied to no alliance," and serving as "a military base for no other country." That would mean withdrawal of American troops, which North Vietnam has been demanding as a precondition to negotiations.

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1947

And when North Vietnam is ready to talk over these essentials, then the United States is ready "for unconditional discussions."

It was that clear.

What if North Vietnam isn't ready to talk? The President's threat was unmistakable: "We have no desire to devastate that which the people of North Vietnam have built with toll and sacrifice * * * But we will use our power."

And what if North Vietnam does wish to make peace? For the first time President Johnson specifically included North Vietnam as a prospective beneficiary of massive development aid for southeast Asia, which could secure its independence from China, among other things. He asked U Thant to organize the development effort among all southeast Asians. He specifically mentioned harnessing of the Mekong which serves all of southeast Asia. He put a billion U.S. dollars on the barrelhead to start the underwriting, and he invited the rest of the world to join in—specifically including Russia—lest anybody think this was an oily American effort to buy southeast Asia away from communism per se.

In a very shrewd way, though, it did represent an effort to buy southeast Asia away from China. Russia can afford to join us hugely in the development financing. China lacks the resources. Russia doesn't want to see China take southeast Asia. Neither does North Vietnam want to be taken by China. The President figures they can all add.

So there it is. It couldn't be clearer. With extraordinary candor, the President has opened a way to a peace desirable to everyone but China—and closed the way to any further doubt about American will if North Vietnam chooses war.

U.S. CONCEPT IS ALL WRONG

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON.—Why is it, it is time to ask, that our position in Asia has declined so sharply though we are widening and intensifying the war in Vietnam?

According to the so-called domino theory, the United States would lose the respect and support of the peoples of Asia if, in confronting Chinese communism, it showed itself to be a paper tiger and refrained from military action. For 3 months, since February, we have applied this theory ever more vigorously. And what are the results? Quite contrary to what was predicted: today the United States is not only isolated but increasingly opposed by every major power in Asia.

With the exception of Japan, which has a government but not a people who support our policy, all the Asian powers are against us on this issue—not only China and Indonesia, but the Soviet Union, India, and Pakistan. The crucial fact is that, although the Asian powers are by no means at peace with one another, what they do have in common is an increasingly vociferous opposition to the escalated war we have been waging since February. India and Pakistan, India and China, China and the Soviet Union are quarreling to the point of war with one another. But they are united in condemning our February war.

GENERAL OPPOSITION

The administration should put this fact in its pipe and smoke it. It should ponder the fact that there exists such general Asian opposition to our war in Asia. The President's advisers can take some comfort, but mighty little, from the fact that allied with us is the Thailand Government in Bangkok, which is independent though weak; the government in Seoul, which we subsidize; the government in Taipei, which we protect; the government in Saigon, which governs something less than half of South Vietnam. Pondering the matter, we must, alas, put into the other scale the ominous, rising anti-Americanism in the Philippines.

The dominoes are indeed falling, and they are falling away from us.

What is the root of all this swelling anti-Americanism among the Asians? It is that they regard our war in Vietnam as a war by a rich, powerful, white, Western nation against a weak and poor Asian nation, a war by white men from the West against non-white men in Asia. We can talk until the cows come home about how we are fighting for the freedom of the South Vietnamese. But to the Asian peoples it is obviously and primarily an American war against an Asian people.

In my view the President is in grave trouble. He is in grave trouble because he has not taken to heart the historic fact that the role of the Western white man as a ruler in Asia was ended forever in the Second World War. Against the Japanese the Western white powers were unable to defend their colonies and protectorates in Asia. That put an end to the white man's domination in Asia which had begun in the 15th century.

ULTIMATE VICTORY

Since then, despite our ultimate victory over the Japanese Empire, the paramount rule has been that Asians will have to be ruled by Asians and that the Western white powers can never work out a new relationship with the Asian peoples except as they find a basis of political equality and non-intervention on which economic and cultural exchanges can develop.

This great historic fact is an exceedingly difficult one for many westerners to digest and accept. It is as hard for them to accept this new relationship with Asia as it is for many a southerner in this country to accept the desegregation of schools and public accommodations. The Asia lands who still instinctively think of Asia in prewar terms are haunted by Rudyard Kipling and the white man's burden and the assumption that east of Suez are the lesser breeds without the law.

Until we purge ourselves of these old preconceptions and prejudices, we shall not be able to deal with Asian problems, and we shall find ourselves, as we are today in Vietnam, in what the German poet described as the unending pursuit of the ever-fleeting object of desire.

Armenian Martyr's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of the Turkish massacre of the Armenian nation, the Governor of the State of Maine, His Excellency John H. Reed, issued a proclamation setting Saturday, April 24, 1965, as Armenian Martyr's Day. I think it is appropriate that Members of the 89th Congress be informed of the action by the State of Maine.

The proclamation follows:

ARMENIAN MARTYR'S DAY PROCLAMATION
STATE OF MAINE

Whereas 50 years ago, on April 24, 1915, the Government of Turkey ordered the massacre of the Armenian nation which before its termination was to take the toll of 1 million lives, with an additional 1 million displaced, ill, and in want; and

Whereas the beginning of the Armenian martyrdom marked at the same time the

opening of the many important contributions to the Allied war effort in World War I by the Armenian nation, affectionately termed "The Little Ally" by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America; and

Whereas the sacrifice of the Armenian nation in the cause of virtuous government, freedom, justice, and human rights serves to remind us that mankind is ready to perish in the interest of noble causes; and

Whereas in this anniversary year of the 1915 genocide of the Armenian nation it is significant to remember those men, women, and children who perished in violence, to honor their memory and pay tribute to their self-sacrifice:

Now, therefore, I, John H. Reed, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim Saturday, April 24, 1965, as Armenian Martyr's Day, and urge that proper recognition be accorded to this solemn occasion.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta and sealed with the great seal of the State of Maine, this 15th day of April 1965, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the 189th.

By the Governor:

JOHN H. REED.

Indianapolis Times Praises Secretary
Fowler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler made an address before the recent meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It was his first major speech since assuming the post of Secretary, and it received a warm reception by the newspapermen who were there.

The Indianapolis Times was among the newspapers which commented favorably in its editorial pages on this address. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial of April 21, which was published in that newspaper under the title "Fowler's Economics Lecture," may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Times, Apr. 21, 1965]

FOWLER'S ECONOMICS LECTURE

In his first major speech as the new Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler last weekend delivered a lecture on economics to a meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The lecture made unusually good commonsense.

Here are some of the points Fowler made:

There is no one theory on which economic progress can rest. We gain by a host of practical policies which are "pragmatic rather than dogmatic, balanced rather than extreme, resilient rather than rigid."

The Government by itself cannot fashion any cure-alls or solutions for economic problems; the prime mover has to be the private economy.

The Government's responsibility lies in sound tax policies which stimulate business rather than hamper it, in a "rigorous" control of Government spending, and in monetary practices which permit suitable long-term credit and make for price stability.

A1948

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 26, 1965

There is such a thing as "excessive" growth in the economy, which can promote inflation. This is to be avoided.

Fowler's statements were in contrast to some of the high-flown ideas we so often hear from Government officials, or even private economists, who talk as though a single pet theory of their own could provide instant prosperity, who never are influenced by the failure of these theories, who complain our national growth has been lagging, who think the Government, merely by spending, can solve everything.

The Treasury Secretary thinks the reductions in sale or excise taxes President Johnson is about to propose will provide an incentive for price reductions and at the same time bolster private purchasing power. But he warned against anything but "prudent" tax cuts—which, for one thing, simply would further the perennial round of Government deficits. Fowler, almost uniquely for a Washington official, seems to think these are bad business.

If the policies Fowler outlined are to be Government policies the next 4 years, then the country can indeed look forward to a burgeoning economy. We hope the spenders and theorists in Congress and elsewhere in the Government will refrain from meddling.

Additional U.S. Aid to Nasser's Egypt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, on April 21, there appeared in the Los Angeles Times an editorial entitled "Additional U.S. Aid to Nasser's Egypt?" the full text of which follows:

ADDITIONAL U.S. AID TO NASSER'S EGYPT?

Can Gamal Abdel Nasser be serious in his reported request for \$500 million in U.S. aid to Egypt over the next 3 years? Ah, indeed he can. Like the patricide who seeks mercy from the court because he is now an orphan, Nasser has always shown an incredible impudence in his dealings with the United States.

Being slow to anger and quick to forgive may well be a commendable virtue, but it is one that has definite limits in international relations. The House recognized this in January when it voted to halt further surplus food shipments to Egypt. Under executive prodding this stand was abandoned.

But the House vote reflected a widespread feeling that in Egypt's case the United States has run out of cheeks to turn, just as it has run out of libraries for Egyptians to burn down.

Most of the \$1.2 billion in U.S. aid to Egypt since 1952 has consisted of surplus food, mostly grain. The United States doesn't want to take this food out of the mouths of hungry fellahin. But an end to U.S. wheat sales, which Nasser has said he expects and has planned for, wouldn't have to do this.

The serious shortages of food and other consumer necessities in Egypt haven't occurred simply because Egypt is a poor country with a too rapidly growing population. The shortages exist because the Egyptian Government has squandered countless millions on needless, unproductive, and largely malicious enterprises of no value at all to the Egyptian people.

Nasser has had no trouble finding the money to sustain a 50,000-man army in Yemen, or to supply Congo rebels, or to subvert other governments, or to pay off on

\$1 billion worth of Soviet arms. With limited resources, he has chosen which courses to follow.

The State Department argues about the need to maintain a U.S. influence in Egypt. What influence? Nasser daily grows chumlier with the Communists and meddles more openly in the business of other nations. He has worked, independently or as a Soviet agent, against free world interests at a score of points.

It is impossible to see why the United States, through aid of any kind, should contribute to the furtherance of these policies. The answer to any Egyptian aid request is written in Nasser's own record.

The opinion expressed is precisely that which I hold on this subject, and it is shared by my constituents, as indicated in their many letters to me over the past months.

In view of Nasser's past performances, and particularly his grossly insulting actions and speeches during this last year, I simply cannot see how the U.S. Government can possibly give favorable consideration to any further request for U.S. aid to the United Arab Republic without a strong, positive indication of a sincere and definite about-face in position and policy.

So far as I can determine, the continued discretion granted to the President early in this congressional session has had absolutely no effect in what appears to be our continually deteriorating relations with the United Arab Republic. A firmer approach to the problem through the executive branch might serve some useful purpose. There can be no question, however, that it appears more advisable to exert pressure for a policy change through provision for prohibition of further assistance in the foreign aid authorization bill now under consideration by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I earnestly caution my colleagues to watch this development closely, and unless some more effective presentation evinces a promise of improved relations, I urge them—on both sides of the aisle—to stand resolute to the position originally adopted by the House in its vote on January 26 of this year, and to do what we can to convince the other body that such position has proved to be correct.

Wisconsin: Mother of Circuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include the attached article.

Wisconsin is best known as "America's Dairyland," but it is also the "Mother of Circuses." The greatest of all, Ringling Bros. Circus, was spawned in Baraboo, Sauk County, hometown of the Ringlings. In this circus city is the Circus World Museum, operated by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. It

is a tremendous tourist attraction, luring increasing numbers every year to see this authentic circus of yesteryear.

It is so aptly described in the Northern Natural Gas Co.'s Transmission magazine, that I submit it herewith in the hope it will prove of interest to those who read this RECORD:

BARABOO'S CIRCUS WORLD MUSEUM

Often, when one thinks of a museum, he is vulnerable to thoughts of a cavernous hall, musty and dusty.

Most museums are not like that, but none shatters this image more than the Circus World Museum in Baraboo, Wis., some 30 miles northwest of Madison.

Cloaked in bright colors and noisily alive, the museum is owned and operated by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and annually it attracts more than 125,000 persons during a mid-May to mid-September season.

Director C. P. "Chappie" Fox, author of five books dealing with the circus life, describes the hubbub of activity simply:

"This is the way it's supposed to be. The circuses of yesteryear were like this. Everything has to be authentic. Sure, there are easier ways to do many of the things we perform and construct here, such as the rehabilitation of circus wagons, but if it isn't authentic the public resents it and we're in trouble."

To do the museum justice, it takes a minimum of 4 hours to see and do everything. A thorough inspection would fill an entire day.

Before the features of the museum are described, it is probably best to answer the following question at this time: Why in Baraboo, anyway?

Wisconsin is probably best known as America's dairyland. It also is the "Mother of the Circuses." Of 100 circuses which emerged from various communities in Wisconsin, the greatest of all, Ringling Bros. World's Greatest Shows, was spawned in Baraboo, hometown of the brothers.

The famed Ringling Bros. Circus was born on May 19, 1884, under meager circumstances—in terms of both finance and talent. After a small parade through Baraboo, the customers were treated to acts of juggling and tumbling and the antics of a clown, all under a tent 40 by 95 feet.

Sympathetic and apparently footloose farmers used their wagons and horses to transport the circus to the next town. In a matter of 20 years Ringling Bros. was challenging Barnum & Bailey for circus supremacy.

Ringling Bros. wintered in Baraboo from 1884 to 1919, but when Barnum & Bailey was acquired, off-season headquarters were moved to Bridgeport, Conn.

Once the circus left town, lore was left to the oldtimers. In the 1940's John M. Kelley, for many years legal adviser for Ringling Bros., retired to Baraboo.

He talked up the idea for a circus museum, and tried long in vain to sell it to the citizens. Finally, after much preaching, the spark ignited in the mid-1950's and Baraboo's businessmen got behind the plan. Circus World Museum, Inc., was organized and a successful fund drive was culminated in 1958.

That same year the city of Baraboo bought one of the nine Ringling Bros. buildings which lined Water Street a couple of blocks from the downtown section. The building was turned over to the museum, and several businessmen banded together to construct two more for concessions. Word began to spread. Soon circus memorabilia began filtering in—circus wagons, costumes, vintage posters, and many others.

On July 2, 1959, the museum opened, complete with parade. Forty thousand saw the

April 26, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150020-1

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1949

parade; 10,000 crowded past the exhibits. Among celebrities on hand was Actress Rhonda Fleming, star of the movie, "Big Circus," which premiered at the Al Ringling Theater in Baraboo that day.

With the museum on sound financial footing, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin took over the operation. During the past 6 years, 3 additional buildings have been purchased, and the size of the grounds has been increased to where it now totals 15 acres.

The museum has a fantastic wealth of articles on display. There are authentic circus wardrobes, photographs, and art work of performing horses, intricate wood carvings, photographs of current circus acts and personalities, flamboyant examples of circus advertising and lithographs, colorful circus wagon wheels, photos of famous sideshows, and a history of the circus in Wisconsin.

Perhaps the most fascinating display is a miniature circus built by John Zweifcl. It is an exact replica of the Ringling circus of 1956 containing 25,000 individual pieces, most of which are animated. The Circus World Museum also owns 40 colorful circus wagons, the largest collection in the world.

Supplying real flavor is a steam calliope which blasts out in concert every half hour. Twice a day, under a smaller size version of the "big top," trained animal acts take to the ring, including three elephants, 12 ponies, dogs, clowns, and acrobats. Twice a day a seven-car circus train on 800 feet of track is unloaded by eight Percheron horses and a chain-driven truck just as it was done in the old days.

Roaming the premises are a goat pulling a wagon in which children can ride and an even-tempered, nonspitting llama named Lloyd.

Another of the top attractions is a 25-minute tour of Baraboo in an open carriage pulled by a jeep where points of historic interest related to the circus are described.

New at the museum in 1965 will be an 85-foot railroad advertising car used by the advance men to beat the drums for the coming circus. The car is the last one actually used by Ringling Bros. & Barnum & Bailey. In the car will be a graphic history of circus printing and design including a pastemaking boiler. The car will even be outfitted with bunks used by the advance men.

Another innovation this year will be a newly acquired side show of memorable circus freaks of the late 1800's, all molded of Fiberglas and housed under a 20- by 40-foot tent.

The Circus World Museum relies entirely on its admissions and donations to stay in the black, and museum officials are quick to point out that the admission price takes care of the entire tour with no hidden fees within the gates.

Of course, not all donations come in the form of cash, but they are equally if not more valuable. "Chappie" Fox explains: "As the fame of the museum has spread, we have received articles and collections from all over the country. We try to work most of them into displays, but one of the greatest values is that it provides an important research function, a key area of our operation."

The Circus World Museum makes a significant economic contribution to Baraboo, a city of 7,500.

First of all, it has an annual payroll of over \$40,000, employing 15 persons during the summer and 9 during the winter.

Of more importance is the tide of visitors each year. After this season they will number close to a million since the opening in 1959.

Fox describes the impact: "Bankers in Baraboo have told me that the average visitor to the museum spends anywhere from \$3 to \$5 in town in addition to our admission. Multiply that by a million, and you have a pretty impressive figure."

Peace and Promise in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the military events in South Vietnam have thus far overshadowed what could be the most significant international cooperative project yet undertaken in the world.

The Mekong River plan has been in the planning stage for some time. This exciting and challenging idea could become reality if a peaceful settlement can be reached in the war in Vietnam. President Johnson has pledged a billion dollars for this cooperative project, and I am certain that the United States stands ready to do even more if called upon for assistance.

In a Washington Star editorial of April 21, 1965, the promise and potential of this enterprise were eloquently described. I take this opportunity to bring the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

THE PROMISE OF THE MEKONG

Although nothing much can come of it until there is a peaceful and guaranteed settlement of the war in Vietnam, there is great promise in President Johnson's offer of large-scale American aid to improve the lot of all the peoples of southeast Asia, including the North Vietnamese. He will ask Congress, he says, to approve "a billion-dollar American investment in this effort" as soon as it gets underway as an international cooperative enterprise. The investment should prove to be good.

The enterprise, as a matter of fact, has been in the planning stage for some years past. Under the leadership of the United Nations, no fewer than 21 countries, a dozen specialized U.N. agencies, and several private business organizations and foundations have been contributing millions of dollars and invaluable manpower to it. The first objective is to begin translating the plans into action, with a view to developing the immense potentialities of the 2,600-mile-long Mekong River, which is one of the world's greatest.

This river, which has its source in Tibet and empties into the South China Sea, has a basin that covers 381,000 square miles, which is much larger than France. The riparian states directly affected are Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and South Vietnam, and it is noteworthy that these four—despite their bitter political antagonisms—have long been working together in support of efforts to harness the Mekong for their mutual enrichment. The economic and social betterment of 50 million human beings is involved, and at least another 50 million will be helped if the basin's potentials are effectively exploited.

In President Johnson's words, "The task is nothing less than to enrich the hopes and existence of more than 100 million people."

"* * * The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA." Experts have estimated, for example, that the Mekong's waters can be used for irrigation effective enough to increase rice production 500 to 600 percent. Clearly, in terms of agriculture, industry and things like rural electrification, the river's harnessing promises to be beneficially revolutionary.

The Asians are well aware of all this, and

great numbers of them—assuming that they hear the Voice of America—must be encouraged by what the President has pledged. Actually, of course, the \$1 billion he has mentioned seems conservative. It probably would be but the start of a much larger American contribution in the event of a genuine international cooperative effort—more or less like the Marshall Plan that saved Western Europe—to stem the Red tide and keep southeast Asia free.

Great Society Question Marks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times has performed a noteworthy service in bringing to public attention some of the serious questions which exist in connection with the administration legislative program.

In an editorial entitled, "Great Society Question Marks" the Times poses questions that must be faced about the far-reaching role the Federal Government would assume at the National, State, and local levels of government under various programs enacted by the Congress and proposals under consideration.

I believe the editorial will be of interest to Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

GREAT SOCIETY QUESTION MARKS

As the 89th Congress completes its first 100 days, President Johnson is getting high marks for the impressive volume of Great Society measures which are becoming law.

Whether it is sound legislation, taking Americans along a route they actually want to travel, is another question.

One thing is clear: Under Mr. Johnson's leadership the Federal Government is assuming an unprecedented role of leadership, even dominance, in areas traditionally in the local and State balliwick.

Under measures already signed, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools will become a reality for the first time—with Washington keeping a veto power over how the money is used.

The so-called Appalachia bill breaks new ground, too, in taxing citizens everywhere to subsidize economic recovery and development in one region.

Federal responsibility for medical care for the aged is asserted in the multibillion-dollar medicare bill which has passed the House.

Still pending are White House proposals to pay rent subsidies to middle-income families, to inject Washington into city planning and to double the antipoverty program.

Each of these measures represents an effort to deal with real problems which must be met at some level of government. The question is which level.

Great Society champions argue that local and State governments have proved unwilling or unable to do the job, and that Washington has the responsibility to move in—which it is now doing.

What is alarming is that such a momentous shift in American government could take place with no true national dialog, and so little public recognition that it is even taking place.

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150020-1

A1950

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 26, 1965

Problem one is that so much legislation is being passed so fast that no one is quite sure what jokers may be in the deck.

Another trouble is that, in a sense, no opposition party exists. Republicans are outnumbered more than two to one in both houses. And many, understandably, are too concerned with rebuilding the party image to take a vocal antipending stance.

Normally, the Democrats would soon fall out among themselves, and a dollar-conscious business community would raise an outcry.

President Johnson, however, heads off such criticism by calling in potential opponents and hearing their views while the legislation is being drafted. Thus, a consensus is reached, with little fanfare, before the bill even reaches Congress.

This is remarkably astute politics, and it makes for deceptively smooth government. But it smothers the kind of public discussion essential to healthy democracy.

What, for example, will be the future costs of medicare, aid to education and the anti-poverty program? No one knows—except that the present price tag is only a starter.

Another foot-in-the-door tactic is to leave legislation purposely vague in order to skirt opposition. The idea is, "pass it now and fix it later."

Mr. Johnson will have his problems later in the form of soaring budgets, higher taxes, court tests, and administrative waste and confusion. By that time, however, there may be no turning back from the welfare state, L.B.J. style.

The Posture of Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the following essay, entitled "The Posture of Neutrality," which was delivered at the graduation ceremony at Hollywood High School on Thursday, January 28, by Miss Nancy Knight. I am not only deeply impressed, but greatly encouraged by the sentiments expressed in her paper, for the very survival of our great Republic depends upon the youth of today.

The essay follows:

THE POSTURE OF NEUTRALITY

Recently, a major metropolitan newspaper published the results of a public opinion poll. The question: Are you in favor of Federal aid to education? The significant conclusion, obvious in the results of this poll, did not lie in the percentage of those who reacted negatively or those who responded affirmatively. Standing out like an ominous flare at the scene of a highway disaster was the frightening fact that more than one-half of those interviewed expressed no opinion at all. These are the neutrals, those who lack sufficient interest to examine, to evaluate, and to take a stand. Progress, whether it is achieved by an individual, a nation, or the universe, always is the product of active involvement. In this great period of social upheaval and change, to what extent are we involved? Are we to be spectators or participants?

History has proven that men who cling to their positions of neutrality have stunted the growth of new ideas and impeded progress. Those who fail to take a stand do not fulfill their obligation to society.

Pontius Pilate is a classic example of a neutral. In his capacity as Roman provincial governor, he was called upon to decide whether Christ should be put to death. The Bible records his evasion of responsibility in Matthew 27: 24 which reads, "He took water and washed his hands before the multitudes, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just man." Pontius Pilate's conscience dictated a course of action. He believed that Christ was an innocent man, but was afraid to resist the majority.

Neutrality may lead to national tragedy. History is filled with events that demonstrate the folly of apathy. For example, the Western powers, although they had promised aid to the point of intervention, if necessary, did nothing when Hungary was invaded by the Russians on October 23, 1956. The Hungarian people lost their freedom because of Western neutrality. To those now living in enslavement, neutrality is far more devastating than war.

Hitler's Third Reich, with all of its atrocities, never would have been possible if men of principle had taken an active stand to prevent it. Less than 5 percent of the German population were Nazis. Hitlerism flourished because of what the remaining 95 percent did not do. The swastika flag flew over more than half a continent because of the refusal of larger nations to become involved.

The inertia of neutrality can also lead to disaster in the destiny of an individual. In May 1964, in the predawn darkness of the middle-class community of Kew Gardens, N.Y., Kitty Genovese was murdered while 37 witnesses stared from their windows but would not call the police or otherwise intercede. Primarily concerned with their own comfort and safety, these 37 witnesses refused to involve themselves. Their neutrality nourished crime and resulted in the death of an innocent girl.

When people take a stand and dedicate themselves to their beliefs, they are then accepting their responsibilities as human beings. The posture of neutrality is neither positive nor negative. It is passive. Neutrality is the doctrine of doing nothing. Any situation of importance requires doing something constructive.

Consider the people of Judea in their great moment of decision when the Syrian King Antiochus ordered them to discard their heritage, abandon their God, and worship the graven images he had placed in their temple. Would not their acceptance have been far easier than the savage battle that ensued? Yet, the Jewish people, though apparently hopelessly outnumbered, did take a stand and did win. It is in celebration of this refusal to remain neutral that the world Jewish community now annually celebrates the happy holiday, Hanukkah.

Or—remember Joan of Arc? She was only 18 years old and unable to read or write, thus being a perfect candidate for neutrality. Instead, she elected to assume military leadership in the fight to save her country. As a result of her efforts, France was saved.

Three hundred and forty-four years later, on December 16, 1773, a band of Bostonian men refused to tolerate the punitive tax on tea which was imposed by the British. To dramatize their protest, they disguised themselves as Mohawk Indians. Brandishing hatchets, they boarded 3 British ships in the harbor, broke open 342 cases of tea, and dumped the contents overboard. This act caused severe new restrictions on Massachusetts from British Parliament. An attempt was made to starve out the citizens of Massachusetts, but their refusal to remain neutral had inspired the people in the other colonies to come to their aid with food and supplies. Instead of neutrality, there was organized action, leading eventually to our Declaration of Independence.

Neutrality is stagnation. Like the auto-

mobile whose gearshift is in neutral, a society which is neutral goes nowhere. Civilization can move forward only if it is geared to move forward. The engine may be running, but the vehicle will not advance if the engine is merely idling. Those of us who are graduating tonight are prepared for a constructive contribution to our society. Those who have educated us have done their best to equip us with sound motivations. But—only we can shift gears. Only we can choose our destinations. We can move in reverse, we can idle and go nowhere, or we can move forward. As free men, we have the right to change destinations. As human beings, we will encounter hazards such as stop signs and detours. But always we must avoid the stagnation of neutrality.

The distinguished American poetess, Edna St. Vincent Millay, was approximately the same age as we candidates for graduation when she wrote one of her most famous poems, "Renaissance." She closes her lyrical rhapsody with this expression of the futility of neutrality.

"And he whose soul is flat—the sky
Will cave in on him by and by."

NANCY V. KNIGHT.

Future of the U.S. Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I am submitting an interesting talk by Mr. William B. Rand, president, United States Lines, at launching of the SS *American Resolute*, at Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa., on April 15, 1965.

Members who share my concern as to the future of the U.S. merchant marine may find these remarks thought provoking.

The talk follows:

Mrs. Mailliard, Miss Mailliard, Congressman MAILLIARD, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to welcome you who are joining with us today in the launching of our newest ship—the SS *American Resolute*.

It is particularly pleasant to meet Mrs. Mailliard and to congratulate her on the perfect swing she displayed in smashing the traditional bottle of champagne and sending the *Resolute* into her natural element a few short hours ago. I must add, also, that she was most admirably supported in her christening role by lovely Miss Toni Mailliard.

In nudging the *Resolute* into the Delaware, Mrs. Mailliard closed the logbook on a particular, and I might say spectacular, class of cargo liners. For this 13,000-ton vessel is the last of five sister ships, which have the distinction of being the first vessels in the entire American merchant marine to have been designed and built from the keel up as fully automated ships.

The SS *American Resolute* is an electronic marvel. The technological advances built into this vessel are such that a single officer on the bridge can control her 18,750 horsepower engines as easily as a Sunday admiral can manipulate his outboard on a postage stamp lake.

A simple turn of a wheel set in a console on the *Resolute's* bridge can dictate the speed of the ship, fast or slow, ahead or astern.

April 26, 1965

In his remarks, Newman added, "Negroes of South Carolina have never spurned a bona fide offer of help. At the same time I believe I voice the sentiment of Negroes in South Carolina when I say that we feel perfectly capable of providing our own leadership in the area of voter registration as well as in other civil rights activities."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call shall be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON DISASTER RELIEF MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 153)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit herewith a report of activity under authority of Public Law #75, 81st Congress, as amended, and required by section 8 of such law.

Funds which have been appropriated to accomplish the Federal assistance determined eligible under this authority are specifically appropriated to the President for purposes of disaster relief.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 26, 1965.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOVIET OFFICIAL APPEALS TO AMERICAN PUBLIC TO END WAR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a very short item appeared in the New York

Times under the title "War's End Urged," under date of April 23, 1965.

We know that a great deal of the opposition to our armed response to Communist aggression against South Vietnam has stemmed from the Communists and those who have been duped into following their line, or those who customarily do so.

I submit to the Senate, however, that unique arrogance has been shown in a Soviet official's writing an open letter to the New York Times urging a sector of Americans to oppose our response to armed Communist aggression and to terrorism. Although I would be somewhat horrified if this became the rule, I believe the New York Times performed a service in publishing this letter on its editorial page of April 23. I wish, since it is quite brief, to read it to the Senate.

The letter reads:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 23, 1965]

WAR'S END URGED

To the Editors:

The expansion of U.S. military operations in North Vietnam evokes serious worries and profound indignation in broad circles of the Soviet public. Through your newspaper I wish to appeal to the American public, and to men of science in particular, to take all possible measures to stop these operations.

YAKOVIN ALEXANDROVICH

KOREAN

Academician, Director, Institute of Radio and Electronics, Moscow, April 20, 1965.

I cannot imagine a U.S. citizen who had some official identity with the Government—and certainly an academician of the Soviet Union must have some such identity—writing a letter to *Izvestia* or *Pravda* and appealing to a sector of the Soviet people in order to influence them in a matter of this kind. This is carrying their Communist propaganda rather far.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF THE STATE OF VERMONT RELATING TO VERMONT'S PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM AND TO RURAL WATER SUPPLY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two joint resolutions which have been adopted by the Vermont State Legislature be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

H.J. Res. 22

Joint resolution relating to Vermont's participation in the Federal highway program:

Whereas the State of Vermont commenced its participation in the program of construction of interstate and defense highways, so-called, in 1957; and

Whereas the Federal act provides that State participation in said program of construction is at the ratio of \$1 of State to \$3 of Federal participation; and

Whereas the Federal act for Federal aid to highways provides for a ratio of \$5 of State money to \$3 of Federal participation; and

Whereas Vermont is and always has been willing to bear its fair share of the expense of those projects designed for the good of the Nation; and

Whereas Vermont with a population of less than 400,000 and a per capita income well below the national average is asked to build highways comparable in size and length to those of States having a much greater populace and resources; and

Whereas the cost of construction and maintenance of highways in Vermont, due to the rugged terrain, and severity of weather conditions, far exceeds such costs in the great majority of other States; and

Whereas other States having a similar dearth of population and resources for highway purposes are laboring under the same difficulties as Vermont: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives: That the Vermont General Assembly hereby exhorts the Federal Congress to reevaluate the contribution formulas of said Federal act for the Federal aid to highways program with the object of reducing the contribution of the State of Vermont, and of other States laboring under comparable handicaps, to a proportion based on the factors enumerated above, or to the same ratio now allocated prevailing in the interstate and defense highway program; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Vermont's Senators and Representative in Congress.

Approved April 21, 1965.

FRANK H. ROWE

Governor.

FRANKLIN S. BURNES, Jr.

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JOHN T. DALRYMPLE

President of the Senate.

H.J. Res. 27

Joint resolution relating to rural water supply

Where it has been declared to be the policy of Vermont that the water resources of the State shall be protected, regulated, and where necessary, controlled under authority of the State in the public interest and to promote the general welfare; and

Whereas the increasing use of water fit for human consumption by Vermonters for residential, recreational, and agricultural purposes is a matter of great public interest; and

Whereas extreme shortages of such water have been experienced in many rural areas of Vermont; and

Whereas such water shortages are not restricted to Vermont but are a national problem well meriting Federal recognition and assistance; and

Whereas it is the primary responsibility of the State and local communities to plan, develop, and distribute water in rural areas; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering specific proposals such as Senate bill 493, introduced by Vermont's Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, to meet the critical water needs of rural America; such proposals designed to provide Federal assistance in the improvement and expansion of existing facilities and the development of new water systems and distribution methods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives: That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont endorses the aims and purposes of Senate bill 493 and urges the 86th Congress to give favorable consideration to legislation embodying the principles set forth therein; and be it further

Resolved, That this assembly believes that section 302 of Senate bill 493 should be amended to permit grants to be made to State political subdivisions, as well as cooperative or mutual associations, and be it further

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8127

became a lawyer, and later joined the Liberal political party, directed the Institute of Arts and Sciences in Oaxaca, was twice governor of his State, and in 1858 became President of the Republic of Mexico. The example set by Benito Juárez is very real in my country. Every Mexican school child learns that, after surmounting tremendous obstacles he became President and saved our Nation and our institutions. Our young people are taught that every Mexican, no matter how humble his origin or how many barriers on his path, can reach the highest positions in our democracy.

With his indomitable courage, his unbending will to save our republican form of government against all odds, and his honesty and clear understanding of our needs, Juárez gained for Mexico the respect of the European powers. They realized that our young Republic was fully able to be a master of its own destiny, and did not need the guiding hand of foreign rulers to reach its goals.

Benito Juárez showed us that our only objective must be the greatness of our Nation, that we must not tolerate foreign interference either in our political affairs or in our economic development and social progress.

We believe that our revolutionary movement of today cannot be fully comprehended without the knowledge of Juárez' contribution to the political and social ideology that made possible the Constitution of 1857, the establishment of boundaries between church and state, and laws pertaining to civil marriage, freedom of worship, and the non-sectarian character of public institutions.

Juárez was the defender of our hard-won independence, and the father of a proud nationalism that inspires us to devote ourselves to the development of the resources of our country for the benefit of the people of Mexico. Along with his insistence on the development of Mexico by Mexicans, Juárez left us a rich heritage in his valiant struggle for the freedom of the individual, and respect for all human rights. Nothing could be more eloquent than his famous pronouncement: "Between individuals as between nations, the respect for the rights of others is peace."

Benito Juárez was twice in New Orleans. The first time he arrived on December 29, 1853, as a weary third-class passenger on a boat that brought him from Havana. Banished by Dictator Santa Anna, who had persecuted him and held him in prison, he was placed on a ship headed for Europe; but when the boat stopped over in Cuba, he decided to come to New Orleans. Here he was welcomed by other exiles: his loyal friends Melchor Ocampo, Ponciano Arriaga, and José María Mata, three of the most important figures in the formulation of plans that culminated in the adoption of the Constitution of 1857, and the Laws of Reform that so strengthened the foundation of our Republic and set the stage for further advance in our own century.

It is natural to imagine the long conversations that Juárez and his friends must have had in New Orleans in dingy boarding houses, on the banks of the Mississippi, in Jackson Park, where they would spend some evenings after visiting the French Market for café au lait and rolls.

Juárez, who came from wretched poverty, reverted to it with characteristic stoicism. Not a word of complaint was ever uttered by Juárez, even when he was obliged to move to a suffocating garret because he could no longer afford lodging in a roominghouse on St. Peter's Street, where he paid \$8 a month.

A Negro woman provided board for another \$8, but that was too large a sum for a man in his circumstances, and he had to accept an even more precarious life. He slept on a cot borrowed from a Mexican pharmacist, bought 10-cent meals at the St.

Charles Hotel, and occasionally fished in the Mississippi not for sport but for food. Whenever possible, he earned a few dollars in a printing shop, and rolling cigars and cigarettes in a wretched house on a street called Great Men. While one of his companions peddled them in restaurants and amusement places, Juárez patiently waited at the corner.

Juárez's daily occupations in New Orleans, when not engaged in such humble bread-winning work, consisted of reading constitutional law, studying colonization plans, reading the newspaper, visiting the post office, and educational and civic institutions. His proudest day was when he was invited by a judge to sit in on a case involving a land grant. His opinion was unanimously approved and he received warm congratulations.

There were also lonely hours, as when he disappeared a whole day to the consternation of the friends who shared his privations, and was discovered that he spent it at the harbor, without a bit of food, watching the ships that docked, and hoping that one of them would bring mail from home.

In June 1855, Juárez returned to Mexico to wage his battle for constitutional government. We may well imagine that it was in this city, in the company of his faithful companions, Melchor Ocampo, Ponciano Arriaga, and José María Mata, that he elaborated many of the ideas later incorporated in the Laws of Reform. From this point of view, those 18 long months of exile were not barren.

As President of Mexico, Juárez restored our Federal Republican form of government, after toppling a French supported empire, and he made us feel tall in the family of nations, in spite of our ancestral poverty and undeveloped economy. A man of incomparable dignity, he never referred to his days in New Orleans as full of anxiety, discomfort, and loneliness.

Juárez visited New Orleans a second time, in the year 1858. He arrived here on the 25th of April, and departed on the 1st of May for Veracruz. He had become President, but was obliged to establish his government wherever he could. And so, from Guadalajara he journeyed to Manzanillo, where he took a ship bound for Colón. From that port he traveled to Havana, and thence to New Orleans. During this brief stay he stopped at the Hotel Verandah Conti, located, perhaps, not far from this Avenue of the Americas.

He returned to our land to give battle for laws responding to the needs of the time, for institutions worthy of a modern society, for the right of a nation to self-determination, for everything held dear by free men. More than any other leader in our national life, he contributed to extirpate from the soul of our Mexican Indians the fatalism which for centuries placed them on a level of inferiority, accepting as natural and preordained all social, economic, and moral injustice.

And now Juárez comes for the third time to New Orleans, but this time cast in bronze, the metal suggested by one of our major poets as symbolic of the enduring quality of his race. He is here, as visualized by Juan Olaguibel, one of our finest sculptors, not as a mere gift from one nation to another, but as a reminder to young and old, that the humblest of origins is no impediment to greatness; that poverty of worldly goods can be overcome by spiritual wealth. May those who glance at his serene countenance on this Avenue of the Americas remember that his life was an inspiration to peoples other than his own. Victor Hugo saluted him as the peer of Abraham Lincoln, and the Congress of Colombia, a sister nation, proclaimed him a hero of the Americas.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of my people, in the name of my gov-

ernment, in the name of the President of the Republic of Mexico, His Excellency Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, and with deep emotion as Mexican Ambassador to the United States of America, I present to the American people and to the city of New Orleans, the statue of our national hero, Benito Juárez. It will remain here for all time to come, as a memorial to a great man of vision and integrity who lived here in exile, thinking only of his people, a man who succeeded in saving his nation from the destructive influence of civil war, and foreign intervention.

We may be sure that Juárez never imagined that his statue would be some day erected by his country in a city where once experienced so much hardship with perfect poise and unwavering faith in the triumph of his cause. May this gift serve to bring to the attention of all peoples the example of a righteous leader devoted to the attainment of the goals most essential to a nation: liberty, dignity, progress.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on April 7, at Johns Hopkins University, President Johnson reiterated our objectives in South Vietnam and our intent to stand firm in securing "the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack." He reaffirmed our desire for a peaceful settlement in this troubled area—but only a settlement with sufficient provisions to guarantee for South Vietnam the ability "to shape its own relationships" free from outside interference.

History has proven that any cessation of hostilities must be followed by constructive programs of development. And the President recognized this critical factor in his call for a cooperative effort for development. He has offered the assistance of the United States in eliminating the ancient enemies of poverty, disease, and ignorance in that strife-torn part of the world. Indeed, this is manifest evidence of our willingness to approach the problems in southeast Asia in good faith.

Diplomatically, the President's address was a masterpiece. It is often fashionable to belittle the inadequacy of American diplomacy at the conference table or in public pronouncements on cold-war activities. The initiative which the President grasped in his recent speech refutes any derogations of our diplomatic endeavors.

A recent editorial in the Dallas Morning News eloquently captures this thought and the impact of the President's remarks in foreign circles.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A POLITICAL DEAL

In the rough-and-ready world of American politics, Machiavelli would have been notable chiefly for his naivete. Considering the sense of timing and skill in swaying public opinion we show in American politics, it is rather ironic that American cold-war diplomacy sometimes seems to be conducted as if we were born yesterday. The early success of the President's Vietnam ploy indicates that may be changing.

April 26, 1965

Here at home, the speech displayed once again Lyndon Johnson's ability to construct a policy with something for everybody. Texas' two Senators, the conservative TOWER and the liberal YARBOROUGH, both hailed the President's talk.

"The conservative Chicago American called it 'in essence, a stonewall policy. The Communists may ram their heads against it, as long as they choose, but the wall will stay where it is. Meantime, there is an inviting detour around it—an end to aggression.'"

The liberal New York Post declared, "The United States has recaptured political and diplomatic initiative * * *. Plainly the tone and substance of the speech represent a major rebuff to those in our midst who have recklessly urged an all-out military adventure in Asia."

Abroad, the speech won praise from allies who have questioned our policy before. Britain's Prime Minister Harold Wilson said the President's "statesmanlike and imaginative approach" offers the Vietnamese "hope of progress toward peace and economic betterment."

Japan echoed this in an even more meaningful way. It offered to help pay for the economic development program the President proposed.

Diplomats spoke admiringly of the President's skill in offering the Reds an acceptable way to give up the war without losing too much face. Others noted the smoothness in which he shifted the weight of world opinion against continuing the conflict onto the Red leaders in Hanoi and Peiping and made a direct appeal to the people of south-east Asia.

But the finest compliment he has received so far on his propaganda finesse and use of the political stratagem has come from those who are best able to judge their effectiveness: Communist leaders in Peiping.

The howls from these professionals are of the hit-dog variety. Peiping radio declared indignantly that the United States "trumpets peace by word of mouth" to induce the Vietnamese to disarm. It pointed out that Johnson "clearly stated" that U.S. forces will not leave South Vietnam and that that country's "puppet government must be assured of its rule."

It noted that the United States made clear it would continue bombing North Vietnam and saw this as a move to force Hanoi to negotiate on U.S. terms. The billion-dollar bonus, it screamed, was "a political deal to weaken the South Vietnamese (for which read Vietcong) people's fight and dissolve the U.S. predicament."

The howls from Peiping's experts at our using a political deal to good advantage may sound humorous, coming from the people who signed the Geneva accords 11 years ago. But they are also the best indication that F.B.J. has struck a nerve.

KANSAS PILOTS LOST IN VIETNAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this Nation's struggle against the infiltrating forces of communism in Vietnam may appear to be on the other side of the world to many, but the war has come home to Kansas.

Although Wichita, Kans., is 2,200 miles from Vietnam, death knows no distance. Two pilots permanently stationed at our McConnell Air Force Base in Wichita have lost their lives in Vietnam, and a third is missing in action. The Wichita community has accepted this tragic truth of loss.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have two articles and an editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle-Beacon, reprinted in this Record at this

point giving tributes to the two lost Kansas pilots.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wichita Eagle Beacon, Apr. 9, 1965]

BASE PAYS FINAL HONOR TO FALLEN FIGHTER PILOT

(By Steve Sells)

"The joy of flying was part of his life. For him, this is a moment of intense joy."

Lt. Col. Erwin R. Ray, base chaplain, McConnell Air Force Base, spoke Thursday of Maj. Frank E. Bennett, Derby, McConnell fighter pilot shot down Sunday in South Vietnam.

In an eulogy during memorial services at the base chapel, the chaplain said, "I don't think he would have had it any other way. His many medals speak of the caliber of the man and we honor him."

Bennett was awarded the Air Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross and 15 other medals in nearly 20 years of active service.

The chapel was filled with 300 persons, family and friends, officers and enlisted men, many of whom wrote their names in a "memory book" to express their sympathy.

Bennett left a widow and five children when he drowned in the Gulf of Tonkin after ejecting from his crippled F-105.

He was the first McConnell pilot reported lost in action in South Vietnam, although Capt. James Magnusson, Jr., Derby, shot down at the same time, still was missing Thursday night.

Eight honor guard members lined the entrance of the chapel as visitors arrived for the services.

In services assisted by the Rev Richard S. Klein, pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Derby, a poem, "High Flight," was read in tribute.

"Taps" sounded over the base as a bugler ended the services.

A "missing man" formation of three F-105's roared low over the chapel in final tribute to a fallen comrade.

[From the Wichita Eagle-Beacon, Apr. 18, 1965]

McCONNELL PILOT DIES IN VIET WAR

Capt. Samuel A. Woodworth, 34, became the second McConnell Air Force Base pilot to die in the Vietnam war when his F-105 Thunderchief crashed while dive bombing a military truck in North Vietnam Saturday.

Mrs. Nellie Jane Woodworth was notified of her husband's death while visiting her parents in Duncan, Okla. She and Captain Woodworth resided at 169 Sunset, Haysville. He was attached to the 563d Tactical Fighter Squadron at McConnell.

Maj. Frank E. Bennett, Derby, died April 4 when his F-105 jet was shot down by Soviet-built Mig 15 and 17 fighters south of Hanoi. Capt. James Magnuson Jr., Derby, was shot down the same day and was still on the missing list early Sunday morning.

Mrs. Woodworth said her husband left McConnell April 8 and had been in Vietnam only a few days.

Woodworth, son of Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Woodworth, Minco, Okla., had been in the Air Force since graduating from Oklahoma State University in 1955. He previously had served in Korea with the Oklahoma National Guard. He came to McConnell in September 1963.

Besides his widow, survivors include three children, Marvin, 9, Kathye, 7, and Alan, 5.

A U.S. spokesman said a pilot, later identified as Woodworth, was killed when his plane failed to pull out of a diving pass against a truck on Highway 12 through Mugia Pass along the border.

[From the Wichita Eagle Beacon, Apr. 9, 1965]

THE WAR COMES HOME

What does the war in Vietnam mean here in America's heartland, half a world away?

For Maj. Frank E. Bennett, of Derby, it meant death, and for his family and friends, sorrow. For those close to Capt. James F. Magnusson, Jr., also of Derby, it means anxious waiting. Major Bennett was reported killed in action in Vietnam this week, and Captain Magnusson reported missing. For George E. Herrington, of Wichita, it means risking his life, though he escaped unharmed from riding shotgun on helicopters flying over South Vietnam.

This news that men from our community are seeing action in Vietnam—that F-105 fighter planes from McConnell Air Force Base are taking part in airstrikes there—suddenly brings the distant war home to us.

We see clearly now what may have eluded some of us before: This is our war.

Vietnam may be distant, its terrain unfamiliar to us, its politics mystifying. But the fact remains that South Vietnam's government is locked in a death struggle with Communist insurgents and our Government has given its word we will help. Rightly or wrongly, wisely or unwisely, we are involved in this war, and this means that Americans must risk—and on occasion lose—their lives.

When our fellow Americans—indeed, our friends and neighbors—are dying, we have no choice but to care about this far-off struggle to seek to understand it, to be part of an informed public opinion that will help our Government choose the proper course in Vietnam.

President Johnson will make a major speech on Vietnam Wednesday night. A solid, detailed report is needed. But needed no less is the careful attention of all of us to what he says. Our fellow countrymen are dying, and we must care.

SOUTH CAROLINA NEEDS NO AID, NAACP LEADER SAYS

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article appearing in the State, of Columbia, S.C., on Saturday, April 24, 1965, entitled "South Carolina Needs No Aid, NAACP Leader Says."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA NEEDS NO AID, NAACP LEADER SAYS

The field secretary of the South Carolina NAACP said Friday he doesn't think South Carolina Negroes need outside help in voter registration.

The Reverend I. DeQuincey Newman, NAACP field secretary, said, "In the last 4 years there has been a 147-percent increase in Negro voter registration without any outside invasion," the Reverend I. DeQuincey Newman said.

"I think this is one of the best records of voter registration anywhere in the South. I think that record speaks for itself as to whether or not we need outside assistance."

"Registration of Negroes increased from 58,000 in 1960 to more than 150,000 in 1964," he said.

Newman's comments were in response to an announcement last week by Congress of Racial Equality Director James Farmer that CORE would send 100 workers into South Carolina this summer to work on Negro voter registration. Farmer is scheduled to be in Columbia Sunday and will hold a press conference.

April 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1951

The bridge installation, however, is really an extension of the ship's main controls, centered in a huge console in the engine room.

But many of you guests here today are shippers, and I'm sure you are more interested in just what a ship like our *American Resolute* can do for you, rather than what makes her run.

Well, to begin with, she can help you pinpoint vessel transit time to a much more precise degree than heretofore.

This is made possible by the easy, 21-knot service speed of the new ship. The vagaries of weather which are often a factor in delayed ocean transit time, are greatly offset by a reserve speed of some 4 knots built into the *Resolute* and her sister ships.

Our fast new Challenger-class ships are today crossing the Atlantic in 6½ days which cuts 3 to 4 days from the old running times.

Speed and efficiency are the key notes throughout the entire ship. Like her 4 sisters and 11 predecessors of conventional design, she has automatic, pushbutton hatch covers, high-speed electric winches. Two of her six hatches have triple hatch openings permitting the spotting of cargo directly to final stowage point without need for shunting or man handling once aboard. These hatches are served by a 70-ton, heavy-lift boom.

The *Resolute* and his sisters have a 700,000-cubic-foot cargo capacity a striking feature of which is 151,000 cubic feet of refrigerated space. This latter area is equivalent to the capacity of 43 railroad cars and is easily accessible to expeditious cargo-handling devices such as forklift trucks.

I said earlier that the launching of the *Resolute* closed the book on the group of ships, which we call our *Challenger II* class.

It did, but it also signaled the start of a new breed of ship even more advanced as far as automation and speed are concerned than the *Resolute*.

We have contracted to build in this same yard five "Super Challengers" which will be powered by 26,000 horsepower turbines giving a cruising speed of 23 knots and a fantastic top speed of some 27 knots. They will be the fastest freighters ever to put to sea.

Additional features of these new ships will include a push-button cellular arrangement for stowage of containers and powerful booms providing lifts of 30 tons, 70 tons, and 140 tons. They will have a 760,000 cubic foot cargo capacity.

The *American Resolute*, the 15 new ships that have preceded her and the score or so more vessels that we plan to build at an overall cost of nearly \$400 million are a concrete indication of the confidence my company has in the future of the American merchant marine.

However, I must confess that that confidence I refer to has been somewhat shaken by certain events of recent years. There is no longer any semblance of a clear policy on the national level as to the future of American shipping—as a matter of fact, we are living today in a climate of confusion such as we have never experienced before. We, who operate American-flag ships, cannot make a maximum contribution to national maritime policy when it is so uncertain as to what that shipping policy is and whose responsibility it is to determine that policy.

We know, however, what we are doing and we think it constitutes a constructive contribution toward a sensible national policy to develop a sound and healthy merchant marine. For example, we know we are pursuing a ship replacement schedule that is saving the Government money and attempting to buy the United States the best performance at the most economical cost. Already, it can be seen that the decision to build bigger and faster vessels to replace our aging fleets of wartime construction has enabled us, through the reduction in number of

units, to reduce the operating subsidies the Government is paying to support U.S.-flag shipping. The payoff on this program increases every year with the substitution of these new vessels for the old. We estimate in my company an approximate saving to the United States of 15 percent of the operating subsidy based on a comparison of 1964 performance of five Challengers in a trade that once required six C-2's. Add on top of this, the saving in future subsidy costs of the automation features now being built into these vessels—a saving which has been estimated to mean \$2 million less subsidy expense over the life of the vessel—and I think that you can see the fact that we have been at work for years in our planning to try to get the Government a greater return for each subsidy dollar spent.

Another contribution we are making—and would dearly love to increase—is our contribution to conserving American dollars toward a more favorable national balance-of-payments position. The American merchant marine annually contributes almost \$1 billion directly to the favorable side of our balance of payment—without the American-flag fleet this amount and another billion to pay for the shipping services our exporters would still have to buy, would represent an additional \$2 billion deficit in the Nation's payments balance. This contribution is a plus factor of the greatest significance to our Nation right now and will probably remain so for a long time.

Another accomplishment in which we take some pride in having played a big part is the great expansionary performance of American exports, the single most vital means of earning dollars for the Nation. The whopping big \$6.8 billion 1964 trade surplus represents approximately a one-third increase over the 1963 surplus, this performance notwithstanding some strong denunciations of liner rate making policies by critics who contend these policies discriminate against American exports. We recently addressed a letter to hundreds of the Nation's leading industrial companies, part of which letter sought comments of protest on this issue of allegedly discriminatory rates. The response has more than reinforced our own belief that the charge is incorrect. We find that what the shipper really does need—rates to keep him competitive in foreign markets—we have been setting, with his interests and his voice, a very strong factor in the determination of the rate.

In all these things we have done I feel we have been fighting a real uphill battle, succeeding not because of our critics but in spite of them. Our present regulatory policy toward the shipping interests of other nations has created an almost impossible climate on the high seas and in the capitals of the major shipowning nations. Regulations by the United States of its foreign commerce, must take into account the rights, interest, and sovereignty of other nations—and our public officials are going to have to face up to this fact. Other governments have different philosophies regarding international shipping and, so long as there is no wherewithal to apply and enforce our laws across the board, on all parties, these laws and regulations operate to the detriment of the one controllable segment of carriers in our foreign trade—the American merchant marine. We have said it many times and we will say it again—we are not against regulation per se but only against ineffective unilateral regulation which traps us in the middle of the great debate on how an international business should be conducted. It seems certain that the United States is bound and determined to regulate the shipping of its foreign commerce in order to eliminate the abuses, real and imagined, which are believed to exist. It seems equally certain that the major shipowning nations are going to oppose any regulatory

action that they feel will endanger the economic welfare of their own lines.

An irresistible force meeting an immovable object? I hope not and sincerely wish the clamor of voices and conflicting policies could be stilled long enough to give reasonable men and interested parties time to cope with this problem.

But this is too serious a note on which to end an occasion of great pleasure and significance to the American merchant marine generally and United States Lines particularly. We feel strongly that the partnership in maritime endeavors epitomized by governmental policy over the years must and will continue, and more and more ships like the *American Resolute* will take their place as leaders in the free world's trade routes.

Faster Pace in the Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in *Life* magazine of April 9, 1965, focuses sharply on our past and current achievements in our national space program. The editors of *Life* point out the evolution of our space program to a valuable and well-planned effort. The comments on the security value of the space program describe well our present status and the alternatives for the future. This editorial puts in perspective the space race at its present point in time and is a valuable critique on the importance of our continued effort in this field.

With unanimous consent the editorial follows:

FASTER PACE IN THE SPACE RACE

These weeks are so crowded with "firsts" and "breakthroughs" in space that man's progress there seems more hectic and jumpy than it really is. First came Russia's *Voskhod II* and Leonov's somersault; then the U.S. *Gemini*, with Grissom's and Young's changes of course in midflight; then *Ranger 9* with its extraordinary closeups of the moon. And this week *Early Bird*, the bundle of audio and video channels which NASA is launching for the Communications Satellite Corp., is aimed to give U.S. private enterprise and intercontinental telephone users a stake in the busy welkin.

The first *Sputnik* was less than 8 years ago, but already the space age has reached what President Johnson calls an "early maturity." Each technical advance is a planned and measured consequence of the previous one; Mercury fed *Gemini* and *Gemini* feeds *Apollo*; each hero stands on the shoulders of predecessors who are also his contemporaries. Since 1958 no fewer than 94 U.S. space flights have left the cape, 59 of them fully successful. At first the ratio of successes was 1 in 2; in the last 2 years it has been 16 to 1.

There are still a few worried critics, such as the *New York Times*, who think the space effort is a distorted use of U.S. resources at a time when we still have terrestrial problems to solve. That is now surely the view from the caboose. Our space program is, as Johnson puts it, "a national asset of proven worth and incalculable potential." Its cost is leveling off at about \$7 billion a year. One hopes this includes enough to land us on the moon before the Russians—and what's wrong with wanting to be first? But *Gemi-*

A1952

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 26, 1965

ni and Apollo (landing target date 1970) provide a safe and sensible program worth sticking to, in any case. Our next unmanned moon shot after Ranger, for example, will be Surveyor, a complex of mechanical eyes and hands that will make a soft lunar landing and send back landscape views, soil analysis and other instrumented information.

There are other worried critics like General LeMay who fear that the Soviets, retaining their early lead in several sectors of space-faring, may achieve a critical military advantage—for example, through a first manned orbiting platform. The U.S. military now has a 20-percent share in our whole space program and could no doubt have more if anyone could describe a more acceptable military mission in space. The one generally agreed on is defensive intelligence and communications, in which the United States already excels. Our program, though less dramatic than the Russian, has already milked the heavens of a lot more new information than theirs.

The first beneficiary of this information has been U.S. technology and industry. Most NASA money involves private contractors, and of the 300,000 men now employed in the moon program only 15,000 are Government employees. And all U.S. industry gradually feels the challenge of the new thoroughness and precision, of the unprecedented tolerances and complexities, that success in space demands.

This challenge is now with us for good. Even before Apollo meets the Moon, we will face gigantic choices for the next adventure. Shall we concentrate on intensive study and mapping of the Moon? Or on the "inner space" nearer Earth, peopling it with orbiting laboratories, rescue stations, etc.? Or on the outer solar system, whither we already have launched a flyby mission, Mariner IV, on its 7½-month trip to Mars? Or shall we pursue all three lines at once?

The choice will be determined in part by comparative costs and by the Russian competition, which still has overtones of secrecy and military menace. But it will also be determined by what we learn from what we are already doing. Our program, which may or may not be overtaking the Russian, is well past its own first period of jumpy desperation. We can stick to it in confidence.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, although U.S. policy in Vietnam has been under heavy attack from various sources and for a variety of reasons, there is reason to believe that recent U.S. actions have placed the responsibility for the continuance of the conflict on Hanoi and Peiping, as is pointed out in the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times, and the article by the knowledgeable observer of world affairs, Mr. Milburn P. Akers:

VIETNAM

The failure of the Communists to move toward peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese conflict has been disappointing. First North Vietnam and then Red China rejected the appeal of 17 nonaligned nations to accept President Johnson's proposal for unconditional discussion to end the war. Red China talks threateningly of Chinese organizations

sending their own people to fight if the U.S. escalates the war further. Premier Kosygin of Russia calls for a cessation of bombing in North Vietnam.

Such public reactions were to be expected but Washington obviously hoped that some private soundings toward peace talks might come from the other side. None apparently has.

These developments have brought demands from some Americans that the United States change its posture. They argue that since bombing of North Vietnam did not move the Vietcong Communists toward a less aggressive attitude in the war and toward peace talks, easing off or stopping the bombings for awhile might so move them. It would let them save face.

We believe Defense Secretary McNamara and Secretary of State Rusk make a better and more pragmatic analysis when they argue that stopping the bombing would do the cause of peace more harm than good. It has raised South Vietnamese morale and lowered the morale of the Vietcong. It has brought heavy political and military pressure on North Vietnam. It has slowed infiltration. Stopping the bombing would be interpreted as a defeat for a major U.S. military undertaking and could cause the collapse of the South Vietnam Government.

When Mr. Johnson offered unconditional discussion—to be carried on without a cease fire—he offered a billion dollars to help southeast Asia to a better life. His speech was promptly labeled the "carrot and stick" approach. Those who deplore the heavy military commitment the United States continues to make in Vietnam would have the President drop the stick but still offer the carrot.

The main purpose in Vietnam must not be forgotten, however. It is to prevent the spread of communism. In the circumstances and as long as the Communists refuse to enter peace talks, the stick as well as the carrot must be used.

Communism is an idea that must be countered by better ideas for improving man's lot. That's the carrot. But communism in South Vietnam is also aggression from North Vietnam and this must be countered by force. The United States has announced it will put more money and men into the ground war in South Vietnam. This is to prove to the Communists that he meant it when Mr. Johnson said, "We will not be defeated." He also meant it when he offered unconditional discussions to stop the bloodshed. When the Reds believe him on both counts, perhaps they will be moved to the talking stage. But they are hardly likely to be moved toward a peaceful attitude by a lessening of America's militant attitude. They never have been in the past.

REDS BEAR VIET RESPONSIBILITY
(By Milburn P. Akers)

Now that Red China and North Vietnam have rejected the appeal of 17 neutral nations for discussions intended to resolve the southeast Asian conflict there should be no confusion as to responsibility for its continuance. For this is the same appeal which President Johnson accepted in his unconditional discussions speech at Johns Hopkins University.

This column has been critical of the U.S. role in South Vietnam ever since the late President John F. Kennedy switched that role from a passive to an active one. And it has been equally critical of the roles of Red China and North Vietnam. Throughout the Eisenhower administration the American role was limited to economic assistance and a military assistance group of less than 685 men which devoted itself to training the South Vietnamese army.

During 1961, Kennedy's first year in the White House, the Vietcong began an intensified campaign, one which threatened the

existence of the Saigon government of President Ngo Dinh Diem. On October 26, 1961, Kennedy pledged "that the United States is determined to help the Vietnamese preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins and build a better life."

On December 11, 1961, the U.S. aircraft ferry-carrier Core arrived in Saigon with 33 U.S. Army helicopters and 400 air and ground crewmen assigned to operate with the South Vietnamese army.

On December 20, of the same year, the New York Times reported that uniformed U.S. troops and specialists were operating in battle areas with South Vietnamese forces and had been authorized to fire back if fired upon. Two thousand U.S. military men were then in South Vietnam.

The escalation of the war in South Vietnam had begun. It has gone on steadily since. It should be noted that Kennedy, as he switched the U.S. role from passive to active, did so as the consequence of greatly intensified Vietcong activity. Each escalatory step by the United States has come as a consequence of one by the Vietcong.

Soviet Russia on January 10, 1962, in a note to Britain, charged the United States with aggressive interference in South Vietnam, a charge which the British rejected with the statement that "the tension in South Vietnam arises directly from the pursuance by the North Vietnamese . . . of seeking to overthrow the established government by force."

Few, if any, newspapermen who are stationed in Saigon, or who have visited there since the conflict began, would deny that British assertion of 1962. I was in South Vietnam in January and February of 1963 and saw plenty of evidence to convince me of the fact of North Vietnamese aid of the Vietcong and of its direct participation in the conflict.

By the time Lyndon Johnson succeeded Kennedy in the White House the United States had more than 12,000 fighting men in South Vietnam. The new pattern had been set although the United States generally continued to maintain the fiction that it was still acting only in an advisory capacity and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, making periodic trips to Saigon, continued to report that a successful conclusion of the war in South Vietnam was in the offing. The direct assaults on military installations by the Vietcong began after Mr. Johnson's succession and the policy of retaliation by air strikes commenced. Today, the United States has more than 40,000 military personnel in South Vietnam.

As earlier stated, this column has for 3 years or more been critical of U.S. policy in South Vietnam. But it has never failed to point out that North Vietnam and Red China are, in fact, the aggressors; that the Vietcong, if only, as some contend, a group of indigenous patriots in rebellion against the Saigon government, could not long maintain themselves in the type of war that has been waged against them. Hanoi and Peiping bear at least as much responsibility for the situation which exists in southeast Asia as does the United States. In my judgment they bear more. And since their rejection of the 17-nation plea for negotiations—a plea accepted by President Johnson—they now bear the entire responsibility for the continuance of that conflict.

This column many times urged negotiations to end the Vietnamese conflict. It has been critical of President Johnson as well as the Hanoi and Peiping regimes for not having sought a resolution of the conflict long ago. Now that Mr. Johnson has agreed to such negotiations and Hanoi and Peiping have refused to participate in them there is little the United States can do other than to wage the war to victory.

Hon. Eugene H. Nickerson, county executive of Nassau, Long Island, N.Y.:

PROCLAMATION ON FREEDOM CRUSADE WEEK

Whereas the Christians of Constantinople are being expelled and persecuted and their properties are being confiscated without compensation; and

Whereas the hierarchy and the clergy of the ancient and venerable Eastern Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Constantinople are being persecuted, deprived of the right to exercise their churchly and religious functions and some of the hierarchy are being exiled unjustly; and

Whereas the people of Cyprus are seeking the rights to establish a democratic government where all the citizens will have equal suffrage, equal protection of the laws, religious freedom and equal educational, economic, and social opportunities; and

Whereas the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, otherwise known as the Order of AHEPA is seeking redress and a solution of these problems in accordance with the American principles and traditions originally enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and which, ever since, have become the cornerstone of the ideals, beliefs, and traditions of the American people and Government: Now, therefore,

I, Eugene H. Nickerson, Nassau County executive, do proclaim the week of May 9-15, 1965, as Freedom Crusade Week in Nassau County, N.Y.

I endorse the basic principle of U.S. foreign policy on self-determination for all peoples and earnestly urge our Government to fully implement and support this policy of self-determination for the people of Cyprus.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to bring about freedom of religion in the Republic of Turkey.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to stop the persecution and exiling of the Christian people of Constantinople.

I further urge on all our citizens of all creeds to participate in the AHEPA Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus, and to pray for a just solution of the problems and the establishment of a just and permanent peace in these ancient places where civilization was born and where all our great religions were first promulgated and established.

Calhoun Bust Presented to U.S.S. "John C. Calhoun"

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our beloved Dr. Robert C. Edwards, president of Clemson University, on March 10, in Charleston presented to the Polaris submarine *John C. Calhoun* a bust of South Carolina's greatest statesman. At the presentation ceremony aboard the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*, Dr. Edwards made a brief but very appropriate address. I commend Dr. Edwards' superb address on that occasion to the Congress and to the country:

REMARKS OF R. C. EDWARDS AT THE PRESENTATION CEREMONIES ABOARD THE U.S.S. "JOHN C. CALHOUN"

Congressman RIVERS, Admiral Daspit, Admiral Loughlin, Commander Axene, Com-

mander Thurtell, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are delighted to have such a splendid audience for this historic occasion. We are especially grateful to Congressman RIVERS for his presence here today. Having recently assumed the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, we appreciate fully the importance of the tremendous responsibilities that rest on his shoulders and the demands made upon his time. It is a great relief to me personally to know that during this most perilous and critical period in our history that we have directing the affairs of this most important congressional committee a man of such outstanding knowledge, ability and dedication as Congressman RIVERS. It was my happy privilege to listen to his marvelous address at the commissioning ceremonies of this great ship on September 15, 1964, at Newport News.

Clemson University, for which I speak, has a unique interest in the ship on whose deck we stand. This ship bears the name of one of South Carolina's—and the Nation's—most illustrious sons, John Caldwell Calhoun.

Clemson University, named for Calhoun's son-in-law, Thomas Green Clemson, whose vision and generosity created the institution, stands on land which was the John C. Calhoun plantation.

The house, called "Fort Hill," was Calhoun's home for the last 25 years of his life, and is beautifully preserved as an historic shrine at the center of the Clemson campus. Calhoun's spirit, as well as Clemson's, pervades the very air each Clemson student and teacher breathes and constitutes an inspiration to all of us there.

This spirit is an inspiration, too, to the officers and men of the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*.

This is the joint heritage which Clemson University is proud to share with the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*.

No American was ever more dedicated than was Calhoun to the purpose for which this ship exists—the defense of our country.

For 39 years Calhoun served the Nation as a Member of both Houses of Congress, as a Cabinet officer under two Presidents, and as Vice President of the United States.

From 1811 to 1817 he was a Member of the National House of Representatives from South Carolina. As acting chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he stood with Henry Clay and others who for their patriotism were called "War Hawks"—a name which has become a badge of distinction again in these troubled times. He stood for strong defense of American rights against depredations of the British, from whom we had only a few years before won our independence.

In his devotion to the protection of the security of this country and the traditions that have made it great, the Honorable MENDEN RIVERS is truly the John C. Calhoun of 1965.

I remind you of those solemn words of Mr. Calhoun when he said, "The honor of a nation is its life. Deliberately to abandon it is to commit an act of political suicide." So he introduced the resolution declaring war on Great Britain in 1812, and his views prevailed.

From 1817 to 1825 he was Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President James Monroe. He reinvigorated many aspects of military administration and clarified the command situation. One historian from another region of the country says, "he gained, as he deserved, a lasting reputation as one of the ablest of War Secretaries."

From 1825 to 1832 he was Vice President of the United States in the administration of President John Quincy Adams and the first administration of President Andrew Jackson.

From 1833 to 1843 and again from 1845 to his death in 1850, he was a U.S. Senator from South Carolina, standing with Henry Clay

and Daniel Webster as a towering figure in the Senate's history.

In 1844 and 1845, between his two periods of service as Senator, he was Secretary of State, holding the highest Cabinet office under President John Tyler.

Such, in barest outline, was the career of John C. Calhoun on the stage of national affairs.

It is appropriate that this ship should be named for him and that Clemson University should help to perpetuate his memory.

Our university, like the statesman whose home it now occupies, is dedicated to public honor and to public service. We are basically a scientific and technological institution engaged both in the research and the teaching so needed by South Carolina and the Nation in this scientific age. This gives us another special interest in a ship embodying the most advanced of technologies. Our university has a military tradition, too, and our sons have served with distinction in every war since Clemson was founded.

For all these reasons, Clemson University is pleased today to present to the Navy for display in this ship a bust of John C. Calhoun.

This bust, an excellent likeness, was once the property of Thomas G. Clemson and has been in the home that was Calhoun's and later Clemson's.

Commander Axene, will you please come forward?

It is with pride and with great pleasure that I deliver to you this bust to the ship as a gift from Clemson University, knowing that the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun* will add new luster to a long-revered name.

Aid of the Arts

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have been dwelling on the importance of education. The need for people to be well educated increases each day, for without it—employment will be practically nonexistent and, without it, the leisure time, automation, and technological developments furnished all, will not be enjoyed to its fullest extent.

As a cosponsor of the legislation setting up a National Foundation for Arts and Humanities, I should like to call the Members' attention to an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette on April 21, recommending passage of this bill:

AID FOR THE ARTS

When the American Symphony Orchestra League met in Pittsburgh recently, its delegates sounded a new policy note for their organization. Reversing a stand taken as recently as 1962, when 60 percent of the members said they favored independence of orchestras from Government money, the league this year decided to endorse Federal financial support for the arts.

As an organization representing 900 major metropolitan and community orchestras, the league made known its new position at a significant time. Congress, too, has changed its mind in the last 10 years. When President Eisenhower in 1955 proposed a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, Congress turned a deaf ear. President Kennedy in 1961 recommended a similar agency, but was rebuffed. The Senate in 1963 passed a Ken-

A1956

April 26, 1965

nedy administration bill to provide Federal aid for the arts, but the House refused to go along. Finally, in 1964, with the support of the Johnson administration, Congress enacted a law creating a National Council on the Arts, an advisory body composed of a chairman and 24 members appointed by the President. Earlier this month the Council—made up of members representing art, sculpture, literature, music, theater, opera, the screen and television—held its first meeting and Chairman Roger L. Stevens announced that the organization wanted to deliberate longer before issuing a magna carta for the arts.

Meanwhile, Congress this spring has been busy on another item of legislation in the field of the arts, this time to set up a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. The earlier objective of providing Federal support for the arts has now been broadened to include the humanities, a step which was initiated by Pittsburgh Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD when he introduced last summer a bill to establish a National Humanities Foundation, an agency intended to match the National Science Foundation and to aid a wide range of humanistic subjects—among them history, philosophy, law, and literature. The latest version of Representative MOORHEAD's bill, which has now been approved by a House Education and Labor Subcommittee, calls for a National Arts and Humanities Foundation which would administer Federal endowments of \$5 million each for the arts and the humanities, plus an additional \$5 million for each endowment to use in matching private donations. In the Senate, similar legislation is being considered in Senator CLAYBORNE PELL's Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee, where favorable action is expected in the near future.

With solid support coming from the administration, from academic circles and from such organizations as the Symphony League, the Arts and Humanities Foundation bill appears to have a good chance of enactment. If this new source of encouragement for music and other half-starved artistic endeavors and for humanistic studies should finally be established, it would help to redress the cultural balance in our society, which tends to emphasize science and technology to the neglect of creative pursuits that are equally important but that do not have the glamor of a race to the moon.

Dodge and Columbia County, Wis., Boards of Supervisors Oppose Soil Conservation Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, after spending the week of the Easter recess in my home district viewing the damage sustained within my district from both tornados and floods, I am convinced more than ever that the administration proposal to reduce appropriations for soil and water conservation programs would be a serious blow to conservation practices throughout the country.

While the headlines have dealt with the serious flood conditions in Minnesota and western Wisconsin, much Wisconsin

farmland is flooded each spring in the small headwater rivers and water basins. Here is where emphasis on conservation practices is most needed and this is where the cutback in funds would be most seriously felt.

Throughout my district I have found farmers and city dwellers alike concerned about this prospect of reduced conservation efforts. This is reflected in the resolutions adopted by the Dodge and Columbia County Boards of Supervisors. The board of supervisors, of course, are the governing bodies of the counties and represent not just the farmer but the town and city dweller as well. These resolutions in my judgment reflect the views of the vast majority of citizens in my district. Accordingly, I include these resolutions of the Dodge and Columbia County Boards of Supervisors in the RECORD at this point:

"RESOLUTION OPPOSING A CUT IN SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS, WHICH WOULD DIRECTLY AFFECT ASSISTANCE TO THE COLUMBIA COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

"Whereas the Columbia County Soil and Water Conservation District program has recognized the need for continuation and expansion of district assistance to landowners in conserving our natural resources; and the inventory of conservation needs has pointed out the large amount of work still needed in our district; and the requests for district assistance increases each year, with a corresponding increase in the application of conservation practices; and district assistance to landowners is vital in keeping our soil on the land, our streams and lakes silt free, our rainfall on the land where it falls, beautification of our county, and protection of our tax base; and the proposed cutback in appropriations for Soil Conservation Service technical assistance to districts would curtail our help to landowners; and the proposed revolving fund would place an additional burden on the stewards of our natural resources; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Columbia County Board of Supervisors affirm the need of continued soil and water conservation practices and that Federal appropriations be continued to meet present and future soil and water conservation practice needs."

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Columbia, ss:

I, Natalie Sampson, county clerk in and for said county do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors on the 31st day of March, 1965.

NATALIE SAMPSON.

"RESOLUTION 4

"Resolution to the Honorable Board of Supervisors of Dodge County, Wis., members

"Whereas the agricultural conservation program of the Federal Government has contributed immeasurably to the prosperity of the national economy and the beautification of the American landscape and the promotion of the conservation of natural resources; and

"Whereas it is proposed that \$100 million be cut from the agricultural conservation program cost sharing funds; and

"Whereas it is proposed to establish a revolving fund through which landowners would be charged a total of \$20 million for Soil Conservation Service technical assistance to districts; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Dodge County Board of Supervisors register its opposition to cutting \$100 million or any part thereof from agricultural conservation program cost shar-

ing funds and to the establishment of a revolving fund; be it further

"Resolved, That the county clerk of Dodge County be and hereby is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Governor Knowles, Senators Panzer, PROXMIER, and NELSON, Congresswoman KASTENMEIER, and Assemblymen Nitschke and Doughty.

"All of which is respectfully submitted this 20th day of April 1965.

"Adopted April 20, 1965.

"JOHN O'DONOVAN,
Chairman, Dodge County Soil and Water Conservation District."

I, Walde H. Mueller, clerk of Dodge County, Wis., do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Resolution 4 passed at a meeting of the Dodge County Board of Supervisors on April 20, 1965.

WALDE H. MUELLER,
Dodge County Clerk

A Revivified United Nations Is Needed in

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the peace-making potential of the United Nations should be put to work in Vietnam.

Recently, I introduced a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 386, to revivify the United Nations and make it available for a role in southeast Asia. The resolution would remove the congressional requirement that the United States keep the General Assembly in a paralyzing impasse over the application of article 19.

In an article in the Evening Star on April 19, 1965, columnist Max Freedman pointed out the opportunity for the United Nations to make a contribution to peace in Vietnam. I include his excellent article hereafter.

I include also an editorial from The Nation of April 26, 1965, on the need for a vital United Nations organization.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1965]

U.N.'S DUTY IN VIETNAM STALEMATE

(By Max Freedman)

UNITED NATIONS.—Without publicity and solely with the desire to promote conditions favorable to a peaceful settlement, the United Nations has taken a watching attitude in the Vietnam situation. In the process it has provided yet another proof of how the United Nations can cast its influence into the scales of peace when more direct agencies of diplomacy find it almost impossible to operate

In his Johns Hopkins address, President Johnson tried a bold experiment in public diplomacy. He appealed for an honorable end to the fighting, while pledging the United States to continue the military pressure on North Vietnam.

In general, it may be said that the appeal impressed only those who are willing to heed the arguments of reason. Our major allies and by far the largest part of the neutral world have welcomed the President's initiative. But there the favorable response ends.

April 26, 1965

A1957

Communist forces in South Vietnam have given no sign they are ready to drop their weapons. With varying degrees of hostility but in each case with open suspicion, the Governments of North Vietnam and China and Russia have returned dusty answers to the President's message.

Equally disappointing has been the response to the British effort to establish contact with the Communist side by the methods of private diplomacy. The imaginativs and constructive offer of the British Government to send Patrick Gordon Walker, the former Foreign Secretary, to the embattled area has thus far produced no visible result. China in particular has been critical of the British role as prejudiced and tainted since it is an axiom of Chinese policy that in the Vietnam war Great Britain is an agent of American policy.

Perhaps France, which like Britain has recognized the Peiping government, may have better access to China's rulers. But even that is highly doubtful, and in any event deeply rooted American suspicions of France would first have to be overcome before there could be an effective French intervention.

Confronted with this bleak response to the President's appeal, alike in public and in private diplomacy, many Americans are eager to put their trust in the more belligerent passages of the Johns Hopkins speech. They are saying that the bombing and military raids must be continued, probably on a more intensive scale, until the Communists come to their senses and accept peace.

These Americans, large in numbers and outspoken in their advocacy, have never placed much faith anyway in the force of world opinion. Force alone is enough for them. They regard world opinion as a mythical thing or as a fraudulent invention that can be manipulated to meet the convenience of the interested governments. But the State Department does not accept this cynicism; nor does President Johnson; nor do millions of Americans who cannot shake their conviction that there must be something profoundly wrong with American policy whenever it cannot be defended and explained in open debate at the United Nations.

The President deemed it wise and essential to state his commitment to a peaceful settlement when faced with an appeal of conscience from only 17 neutral nations. The cry of the neutral world would become much louder and more insistent if the President should ever drift into the folly of regarding his pledge of peace as a dead letter. The search for a negotiated settlement must remain therefore as a fixed and urgent priority of American policy, regardless of the changes and chances in the military struggle and regardless of the clamor to impose a solution by military means.

Under the charter of the United Nations, Secretary General U Thant has an inescapable duty to do what he can to compose the crisis in Vietnam even though China and North Vietnam are not bound by the principles of the world organization. The situation in Vietnam is quite plainly a threat to world peace and therefore comes within his jurisdiction and is a proper matter for the concern of the United Nations. The Secretary General, as a former leader of Burma, has the most detailed knowledge of the whole problem of Vietnam and can make an important personal contribution to its study and resolution.

Some weeks ago the Secretary General was denounced by large sections of American opinion for a personal statement on Vietnam which was well intentioned but blunderingly phrased and sadly misunderstood. But this experience has at least freed him from the suspicion of being the creature or agent

of American policy and given him the chance to use the full prestige of his great office for peace. Behind the scenes and against great odds he is now quietly preparing the United Nations for the time, still distant unfortunately, when it can bring peace in Vietnam closer to the agenda of diplomacy.

[From the Nation, Apr. 26, 1965]

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE U.N.

Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, like certain other consorts of royal ladies is a very conscientious fellow, and well informed on all sorts of industrial and governmental matters. When, the other day, he was called on to speak at the University of Michigan, he gave much better value, in return for his honorary degree, than is usual on such occasions. Democracy, he pointed out, is not for the indifferent, for those who feel that those in authority should solve the problems and leave the citizen to his own concerns. Perhaps this was true once, Prince Bernhard went on, "but the problems which face those in authority, whether in parliament or in government or in other high stations in life in our modern world, prove to be beyond their powers of solution since they involve the whole of mankind."

Prince Bernhard was not speaking, particularly of the United Nations, but this statement could hardly have been more apropos in that connection. Indeed, after the impasse at the last session of the General Assembly, it is clearer than ever before that an international body, even when limited to an ancillary role, is indispensable to the solution of international problems. The U.N.'s past failures and frustrations are the strongest testimony to its value: when it failed, the reason was that it intervened in situations so desperate that intervention seemed imperative, and it was defeated by the very nationalistic passions it had been founded to control.

Discerning observers see this clearly, and have no intention of writing off the U.N. Its vitality will be restored to the extent that the great powers cease using it as instrument of their cold war objectives. "International events of recent weeks," Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, told his colleagues late in March, "seem to have overwhelmed the capacity of this Government for affirmative action, except in the military field." He was referring to Vietnam, but then he reminded the Senate that when the United States had turned the screws on the Russians (and the French) in an effort to stigmatize them as delinquent debtors in the Congo operation, he and other Senators had sought to learn from the Department of State what the American reaction would be if the General Assembly were to send a U.N. force into some area in which American interests were involved on the other side. Would the United States pay up? The State Department would not even discuss the question and, considering what its policies have been, the evasiveness is understandable.

When the Russians stood fast, the United States decided that to wreck the U.N. would not be in our interest. Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, has recently given several practical reasons for revivifying the U.N. as speedily and thoroughly as possible. If the Vietnam conflict does not expand into a general war and the belligerents are eventually dragged by self-interest to the negotiating table, the U.N. will be needed to further peacemaking efforts, to administer the aid program envisioned by President Johnson, to supervise an election if one is agreed on, and to take care of other contingencies that may arise. Mr. Reuss suggests that the United States should cease its

futile invocation of article 19 of the U.N. Charter. The Aiken and Reuss moves may have administration backing. If not, they should have.

President Johnson's "100 Days"—A Remarkable Record of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a most informative article in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report describes the remarkable record of achievement by President Johnson and the Democratic 89th Congress during the 1st 100 days of this session. According to the article "nothing to touch it has been seen since F.D.R.'s first 100 days." Those who carefully examine the record certainly agree.

The U.S. News observations are much like the comments that I made last week in my own newsletter. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the U.S. News article and my April 22 newsletter at this point:

L.B.J.'s "100 Days"—A RECORD PILING UP

It's one success after another for Lyndon Johnson. That has been the record of the 1965 session of Congress to date. Bills that have been bogged down for years are sailing through now. Nothing to touch it has been seen since F.D.R.'s first 100 days.

Not since this first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt back in 1933 has a President enjoyed the success with Congress that Lyndon Johnson now is enjoying.

In that prelude 32 years ago, the Nation was emerging from a financial panic with people united in a demand for action. The rapid-fire enactment today of new laws of major importance is coming at a time of high prosperity and of national contentment.

The Johnson record, as a result is being cited by some of the President's aids as even more impressive than the Roosevelt record.

In quick succession, Congress has taken these actions:

Gold backing for deposits with Federal Reserve banks was ended without so much as an argument. The vote: 300 to 82 in the House; 74 to 7 in the Senate.

A billion-dollar development program for the 11-State area in the East known as Appalachia sailed through the form the White House asked. The vote: 257 to 165 in the House, and 62 to 22 in the Senate.

An aid program for local schools starting at \$1.3 billion a year passed both Houses of Congress without a single major change from White House plans. In this case fundamental issues of policy and constitutional principle were involved. The vote: 263 to 153 in the House; 73 to 18 in the Senate.

For years, Presidents have tried to get from Congress approval of a plan for meeting costs of hospital care for elderly people under social security. Always they met defeat. Lyndon Johnson is about to achieve success where others failed. The House has voted medicare, 313 to 115. The Senate, having approved plans in the past, will join in, and could even broaden the plan.

It's the same story with a law to provide Federal supervision of local elections to assure Negroes the right to register and vote

A1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 26, 1965

in areas where they now meet discrimination. Action by the Congress has been blocked in the past. It is about to be taken now.

Congress also is about to approve and submit to the States an amendment to the Constitution providing for an appointment to the Vice-Presidency if that office becomes vacant. It also provides for a line of action if a President is assassinated, dies or is disabled while in office.

The House approved this plan April 13 by 368 to 29. A similar measure went through the Senate unanimously.

Excise taxes are to be reduced by more than \$1.7 billion later in 1965. In this case, Mr. Johnson may have difficulty restraining the urge in Congress to make larger reductions than he wants.

The success story carries all along the line. The "poverty war" will be given \$1.5 billion more to spend. A battle is mounting over the way this money is being used, but critics are saying that, politically, money is money in congressional districts.

There will be the usual approval of foreign aid and approval for a wide range of other White House proposals.

What the President wants: The record suggests this: Nearly anything President Johnson really wants from the 89th Congress he can get. In the Senate today are 68 Democrats and 32 Republicans. In the House there are 294 Democrats and 140 Republicans, with 1 vacancy.

In 1964, during the year when he served out the term of the late President John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson started to make the record that is being developed fully in 1965.

That year, the new President pried loose a tax-cut bill that had been tied up in the Senate Finance Committee while Mr. Kennedy was in office.

President Johnson, too, got through Congress a new law governing civil rights of Negroes—a measure that had been bogged down earlier in Congress and had blocked action on most of the other legislative plans of the late President.

Now the President's program seems to have clear sailing.

There is some doubt that Congress will grant the President's request for a new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development, but a large part of his urban program is likely to be enacted. Also headed for passage is President Johnson's plan to improve water resources and to help cities control air and water pollution.

The President, in fact, has outlined as broad a program for expansion and improvement as Mr. Roosevelt proposed for recovery from depression. And the record of Mr. Johnson's 100 days during the present session of Congress suggests that, with huge Democratic majorities in House and Senate, the President will push most of his projects through.

In the 32 years which have passed since the first 100 days of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, there have been innumerable discussions about the achievements of the Congress in those short 100 days. The actions taken way back then were considered to be fantastic, as indeed they were. Few people, even the most knowledgeable ones, expected a later Congress and administration to match the output of the great 73d Congress. To the delight and surprise of nearly all, the 89th Congress has given the 73d a run for its money.

The United States was in the depths of a horrible economic depression when F.D.R. took office. The people wanted relief and action and they got it in the form of the NRA, the Bank Holding Act, the Bank Moratorium, and the Emergency Relief Act, to mention the major bills passed. The administration was great, and so was the Congress.

In 1965, when Lyndon B. Johnson took office, he had with him a tremendous popular mandate and an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress, but there were no really great legislative demands from a people enjoying relative prosperity. The President had his own program, however, and he wasted not a minute in making his recommendations to what has turned out to be an eager and responsive Congress. The results have been nothing short of sensational in President Johnson's first 100 days.

The first measure of importance to travel the whole distance and become law was L.B.J.'s program for poverty stricken Appalachia. The Senate acted first, and then the bill was placed in the hands of the extraordinarily skillful Representative ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama's only liberal Member. JONES steered the bill through without a single amendment—a splendid and unusual achievement.

The Appalachia legislation will help not only the States directly involved but will benefit the whole Nation as the economy of that poor area improves. New markets will open, and thousands of men will be put back to work to take their places as taxpayers and customers. Their children will receive better educations and, hopefully, be prepared to enter the job market equipped to be employed.

The President's next legislative victory ended a fight of nearly 100 years within the 100 days when the great education bill sailed through the Congress. In this instance, the bill originated in the General Education Subcommittee of the House. From the time it left our subcommittee, all the way to the President's desk for signature, not one comma in it was changed. In this case, the bill was handed to the colorful and able Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. He duplicated Representative JONES' feat of passing the bill unamended. Several of my earlier newsletters have discussed the education bill in depth, so I shall say only that the entire Nation will benefit permanently from the education program.

Following the education bill, the House passed a massive revision of the social security law including President Johnson's medicare program. Only a year ago, the Senate passed a medicare program, but it failed to get out of Committee in the House. Many feel that the last Congress would have defeated medicare if it had reached the House for a vote. We will never know, but it's safe to say that the margin would never have been within a hundred votes of what it was in the 89th Congress. As time goes by, I shall make available to my constituents the many details of the medicare and social security programs. They are marvelous, in my opinion.

As we break for a few days' rest, we are confident that a voting rights bill will be ready for action upon our return. A great national demand has built up favoring this legislation, and I suppose that we can thank Alabama's Governor George Wallace and his red-neck pals for that demand. There have been many martyrs in the cause of equal rights who shall be remembered long after the Wallaces have been forgotten. Their monument will be the real emancipation of the southern Negro. The red-neck monument will be the shame they brought to their neighbors and to the Nation.

Before it leaves office, a long time from now, the Johnson administration will have done much more than its sensational 100 days have already brought forth. The administration recognizes the needs of the people and of the country and intends to meet those needs. There will be mistakes, too, for this is the nature of things. I predict though a favorable balance sheet in the history books and am honored to have a small part in the making of that history.

Citation for Dr. Paul Hamilton Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recently, Dr. Paul Hamilton Allen, a respected and well-known botanist for the United Fruit Co., passed away. Dr. Allen had devoted his life to horticulture and botany, living with his wife, Dorothy Osdieck Allen, within the tropics. His contributions to these fields were many and he was recognized as the leading authority on palms. As a result of his work the number of known species of palms was more than doubled.

On March 26, at the annual meeting of the Fairchild Tropical Gardens in Miami, Fla., the Robert H. Montgomery Palm Medal was awarded, posthumously, to Dr. Allen. Dr. Walter H. Hodge of the National Science Foundation, in presenting this award to Mrs. Allen, read a citation describing the life and work of this dedicated scientist.

I call the attention of my colleagues to this citation, the text of which follows: ROBERT H. MONTGOMERY PALM MEDAL CITATION FOR PAUL HAMILTON ALLEN

It would be hard to say when the late Paul Allen saw his first living palms. It is doubtful that it was in his native Oklahoma. More likely it was as a student at the Missouri Botanical Garden whose conservatories in the thirties were at their horticultural zenith. Soon he was to see palms in their native haunts in Panama. The garden was initiating a modern flora of that botanically important isthmian country and, as an impressionable young man, Paul Allen had the great good fortune to be included in a plant collecting trip to that land. As any good botanist could have predicted he was thrilled and excited by the great green world of the tropics. In 1936 he returned for good with a new wife, Dorothy Osdieck of Kirkwood, Mo., who was to love the tropics with as much zest as her young husband. Except for a brief respite in 1953, when Paul served as director of the Fairchild Tropical Garden, the Allens lived their married life within the tropics.

His first job was to manage the Missouri Botanical Garden Tropical Station based in the Canal Zone. Palm collecting was part and parcel of the overall task of assembling the herbarium collections and associated data on which the Panama flora was to be based. Paul Allen's success is demonstrated in the account of the palms prepared for this flora by Liberty Hyde Bailey in 1943. Prior to 1936 only 37 species of palms were known from Panama. Paul's field efforts more than doubled this number and in so doing 13 new Panamanian palms were discovered, 5 of which very appropriately honor the name of this superb and discriminating plantman.

In subsequent years Paul Allen developed a special affection for the palms along with his other major plant love—the orchids. Under the kindly aegis of a new employer, the United Fruit Co., he studied the flora—including the palms—of Costa Rica, Honduras and El Salvador. During this time several new palms were named by him—primarily in the genera Roystonea and Cryosophila. In the fifties a new young society devoted to these principles of plants was formed. Paul Allen served the Palm Society